

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY, 1870.

ART. I.—PROTESTANT LONDON.

The Seven Curses of London. By JAMES GREENWOOD, the "Amateur Casual."
London: Stanley Rivers & Co.

MR. GREENWOOD'S is a very valuable book, because he knows London intimately, without having lost by familiarity his sense of that utter horror which its social and moral condition must surely excite in any man when he first becomes acquainted with it. This value can hardly be exaggerated. Nothing is so necessary as to impress upon every well-meaning man and woman in England what the real state of English society is. We are living over a volcano. It is impossible to believe that such a state of things can be permanent. The life-blood of our country is tainted by a deadly disease; how long it may retain possession without being fatal who can say. This is merely the natural view of the case. But the true view is not the natural but the supernatural; for, whatever things may appear, they really are, what they are in the eyes of God, and nothing else. The truly momentous question therefore is, whether His blessing will permanently rest upon a nation in which a social system, such as Mr. Greenwood exposes, is allowed to go on unchecked; and, whether the social and moral condition of London must not bring down judgment upon us, even if we were as yet unable to trace, upon merely natural principles, the danger which it involves.

Our author enters at once upon his subject. The first of the seven curses of London is its "neglected children," and the first words of his book (which begins without Preface or explanation) are these.

It is a startling fact, that in England and Wales alone at the present time, the number of children under the age of sixteen, dependent more or less upon the parochial authorities for maintenance, amounts to three hundred and fifty thousand.

It is scarcely less startling to learn that annually more than a hundred thousand criminals emerge from the doors of the various prisons, that, for short time or long time, have been their homes, and with no more substantial

advice than to take care that they don't make their appearance there again, are turned adrift once more to face the world, unkind as when they last stole from it. This does not include our immense army of juvenile vagrants. How the information has been arrived at is more than I can tell ; but it is an accepted fact, that daily, winter and summer, within the limits of our vast and wealthy city of London, there wander, destitute of proper guardianship, food, clothing, or employment, *a hundred thousand* boys and girls in fair training for the treadmill and the oakum-shed, and finally for Portland and the convict's mark" (p. 1).

This sentence is a fair specimen of the author's style. It has no special literary force or beauty, nay, there is often a want of order which suggests a less practised writer than he is said to be. In this extract, for instance, the number of convicts among us is introduced in the midst of his statistical statement about the number of neglected children. But the facts he states are so momentous, and he himself is so evidently impressed, nay, carried away by their terrible importance, that none but a cold-blooded critic will find leisure, when reading them, to think of the author's style, or of anything else. One hundred thousand children in our streets under regular training for a life of misery and crime. Consider for a moment what it means. Laws and police, prisons and punishments, will always be necessary, because in every generation there are those who "take to evil courses." They fall before the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil, and if unrestrained, would prey upon society. There will always be too many of this class ; but its numbers will vary according to circumstances, and according to the wisdom and care shown in the education of the rising generation and the government of that already grown up. But it is ever to be remembered, that it is in addition to this class, that we have, according to our author, no less than a hundred thousand children training up for no other way of life, no other profession. It is, as if, like conquerors of old dividing the spoil of a city, we should first set apart a hundred thousand children as the devil's own share, and then go on, to try our chance with him, for good or evil, with regard to the remainder.

When we consider how frail infant life seems in our own well-guarded nurseries, it is a marvel how these infants, who run or crawl wild in our streets, like the unowned dogs of an eastern city, manage to live at all. No doubt, with regard to a vast number of them, the answer is, that they do not live, but die. The explanation of the mystery, with regard to a very large proportion of those who are actually reared, is to be found, we believe, in the natural kindness towards children even of the most degraded, especially among women. Mr. Greenwood will agree with us in this, for he says, with more force than grammar—

Wonderful as it may seem, it is not in well-to-do quarters that the utterly-

abandoned child finds protection, but in quarters that are decidedly the worst-to-do, and that, unfortunately, in every possible respect, than any within the city's limits. The tender consideration of poverty for its kind is a phase of humanity that might be studied both with instruction and profit by those who through their gold-rimmed spectacles regard deprivation from meat and clothes, and the other good things of this world, as involving a corresponding deficiency of virtue and generosity. They have grown so accustomed to associate cherubs with chubbiness, and chubbiness with high respectability and rich gravies, that they would, if such a thing were possible, scarcely be seen conversing with an angel of bony and vulgar type. Nevertheless, it is an undoubted fact, that for one child taken from the streets in the highly-respectable West-end, and privately housed and taken care of, there might be shown fifty who have found open door and lasting entertainment in the most poverty-stricken haunts of London. In haunts of vice too, in hideous localities inhabited solely by loose women and thieves. Bad as these people are, they will not deny a hungry child. It is curious the extent to which this lingering of nature's better part remains with these "bad women." Love for little children in these poor creatures seems unconquerable. As every one can attest, whose duty it has been to explore even the most notorious sinks of vice and criminality, it is quite common to meet with pretty little children, mere infants of three or four years old, who are the pets and toys of the inhabitants, especially of the women. The frequent answer to the inquiry, "Who does the child belong to?" is, "Oh, he's anybody's child," which sometimes means that it is the offspring of one of the fraternity who has died or is now in prison, but more often, that he is "a stray," who is fed and harboured there simply because nobody owns him (p. 41).

We are glad to see the opinion we long ago formed on this subject, confirmed by one who knows our most degraded classes so well. However, he suggests another explanation.

They draw a considerable amount of their sustenance from the markets. And really it seems that by some miraculous dispensation of Providence, garbage was for their sakes robbed of its poisonous properties, and endowed with virtues such as wholesome food possesses. Did the reader ever see the young market-hunters at such a "feed," say in the month of August or September? It is a spectacle to be witnessed only by early risers, who can get as far as Covent Garden by the time that the wholesale dealing in the open falls slack, which will be about eight o'clock, and it is not to be believed unless it is seen. They will gather about a muck-heap, and gobble up plums, a sweltering mass of decay, and oranges and apples that have quite lost their original shape and colour, with the avidity of ducks and pigs. I speak according to my knowledge, for I have seen them at it. I have seen one of these gaunt, wolfish little children, with his tattered cap full of plums of a sort, one of which I would not have permitted a child of mine to eat for all the money in the Mint, and this at a season when the sanitary authorities, in their desperate alarm at the spread of cholera, had turned bill-stickers, and were begging and imploring the people to abstain from this, that, and the

other, and especially to beware of fruit, unless perfectly sound and ripe. Judging from the earnestness with which this last provision was urged, there must have been cholera enough to have slain a dozen strong men in that little ragamuffin's cap, and yet he munched on till that frowsy receptacle was emptied, finally licking his fingers with a relish. It was not for me forcibly to dispossess the boy of a prize which made him the envy of his plumless companions, but I spoke to the market-beadle about it, asking him if it would not be possible, knowing the propensities of these poor little wretches, so to dispose of the poisonous offal that they could not get at it. But he replied, that it was nothing to do with him what they ate so long as they kept "their hands from picking and stealing." Furthermore, he politely intimated, that "unless I had nothing better to do," there was no call for me to trouble myself about the "little warmint" whom nothing would hurt. He confided to me his private belief that they "were made inside something after the orsestrech, and that farriers' nails would not come amiss to 'em, if only they could get 'em down." However . . . that real danger is incurred by allowing [fruit offal] to be consumed as it is now, there cannot be a question. Perhaps it is too much to assume that the poor little beings whom hunger prompts to feed off garbage, do so with impunity. It is not improbable that in many cases they slink home to die in their holes, like poisoned rats. That they are never missed in the market is no proof of the contrary. Their identification is next to impossible, for they are as like each other as apples in a sieve, or peas in one pod. Moreover, to tell their number is out of the question. It is as incomprehensible as is their nature. They swarm as bees do, and arduous indeed would be the task of the individual who undertook to reckon up the small fry of a single alley of the hundreds that abound in Squalor's regions. They are of as small account in public estimation as stray street curs, and, like them, it is only when they evince a propensity for barking and biting that their existence is recognized. Should death, to-morrow morning, make a clean sweep of the unsightly little scavengers who grovel for a meal amongst the market heaps of offal, next day would see the said heaps just as industriously surrounded (p. 10).

We have indulged ourselves in this long extract as a fair specimen, both of the author's style and of the cordial sympathy which he feels and expresses for the classes who are too generally either wholly overlooked, or regarded merely as nuisances to be got rid of. This generous tone runs through his volume; when he is speaking of "professional thieves" and "fallen women" as well as of "neglected children." To return to the children, however; it is impossible to exaggerate the sense of blank misery with which his picture fills us. That multitudes come to a premature death is really the most consolatory fact connected with them. The fault of the book is a defect of order and arrangement, which makes it doubly difficult to think of any remedy for the social condition he unveils, because, while you are thinking of one part of the subject, you find yourself unexpectedly in another. But this defect is small compared with its many merits. We must add, what is not a

defect so much as a testimony to the monstrous and complicated evils of the existing state of things, that he hardly anywhere suggests a remedy, and that the few suggestions of the sort which he does make are lamentably out of proportion to the evils he describes. As far as we remember, his only practical suggestions are, that the "rookeries," where so many of the lower classes of London poor are accumulated, should be pulled down, and that emigration on a large scale should be encouraged. Both excellent in their way, no doubt; but if both were fully carried out, one can hardly imagine that any perceptible diminution would be effected in the huge, sweltering mass of sin and misery.

We have touching descriptions of poverty. For instance, he visits a family of six, occupying, night and day, one small room, three children of which had been wholly and absolutely without clothes for three months, and "so hideously dirty that every rib bone in their poor, wasted bodies showed plain, and in colour like mahogany"; in another the baby had for a cradle a gooseberry-sieve, "with a wisp of hay to lie on"; and when he entered, the elder boy was undergoing vigorous discipline for allowing the donkey to eat the "darlint clane out o' bed." These ludicrous scenes are really the only relief of the gloom which covers the whole.

The second chapter gives a miserable account of the "mothers" of these "neglected children." Mr. Greenwood believes that the evil originates, in great measure, because, in modern society, men who would formerly have been content to work for wages, must needs set up as masters, and "live by scheming the labour of others, that is, of little children—any one." "When their 'hands' cease to be children, these enterprising tradesmen no longer require their services, they are despatched to make room for a new batch of small toilers, eager to engage themselves on terms which the others have learned to despise, while these last unfortunates are cast adrift to win their bread—somehow." He adds that any one who posts himself, "between the hours of twelve and two, at the foot of London or Blackfriars Bridge," will see "the young girl of the slop-shop or the city 'warehouse,' hurrying homeward, on the chance of finding a meagre makeshift, 'something hot,' that may serve as a dinner."

Haggard, weary-eyed infants, who never could have been babies, little slips of things, whose heads are scarcely above the belt of the burly policeman, lounging out his hours of duty on the bridge, but who show a brow on which, in lines indelible, are scored the dreary account of the world's hard dealings with them. Painfully puckered mouths have these, and an air of such sad, sage experience, that one might fancy, not that these were young people, who would one day grow to be old women, but rather that, by some inversion of the natural order of things, they had once been old and were growing young again; that they had been seventy at least, but had doubled

the brow of the hill of age instead of crossing it, and retraced their steps, until they arrived back again at thirteen, the old, old heads planted on the young shoulders revealing the "secret." This, the most melancholy type of the grown-up, neglected infant, is, however, by no means the most painful of those that come trooping past in such a mighty hurry (p. 16).

Then follow the different classes of these poor children, for they are little more; some "dogged and sullen-looking," some ailing and sickly-looking, some "flashy and flaunting"; which last, if properly trained, would "grow to be clever, capable women, women of spirit and courage and shrewd discernment"; but who are "the curse and bane of workrooms, crowded with juvenile stickers or pasters or workers in flowers or beads." These, however, are not, according to our author, the neglected children; they are their mothers. Whatever has been said to the contrary, the estate of matrimony among this class is not lightly esteemed; one indication of this is the custom of hanging up the "marriage lines" under the clock, which is said to be "lucky." But marriage is not common, on account of the expense.

Chapter III., one of the most depressing of all, is on "Baby-Farming." It seems to be a regular trade in London, and Mr. Greenwood declares that there is a class of newspapers in which the baby-farmers constantly advertise. "As I write, one of these newspapers lies before me. It is a daily paper, and its circulation, an extensive one, is essentially among the working class, especially among working girls and women." This is shown by the style of its advertisements. "Column after column tells of the wants of servants and masters. "Cap hands," "feather hands," "artificial flower hands," "chenille hands," "hands for the manufacture of chignons and hair-nets, and bead work, and all manner of plaiting, and quilting, and gaufering in ribbon and net and muslin"; and mixed with these are the advertisements by which "the baby-farmer fishes wholesale for customers." Of these specimens are given. Children are taken to nurse for a few pence a day, or they are "adopted," to be fed, clothed, educated, and nursed in sickness and health for from twelve to fifteen pounds. The children we may hope, as a general rule, are speedily released by death. Mr. Greenwood believes "a large proportion of the young 'human Pariahs that haunt London streets were children abandoned and left to their fate by mock adopters.'" Mothers are tempted, by flattering promises for the children, and by the hope of escaping absolute ruin, to have recourse to them, and often pay more than they can afford; but the happiest of the children are those which are practically murdered out of hand. Mr. Greenwood gives a curious account of his answering one of the advertisements himself, and afterwards visiting the place, where he found a "pipe-smoking, beer-swigging, unshaven, dirty, lazy ruffian, nursing a poor little

creature less than a year old, as I should judge, with its small, pinched face reposing against his ragged waistcoat." "It would appear too much like 'piling up the agony' did I attempt to describe that baby's face. It was that of an infant that had cried itself to sleep, and to whom pain was so familiar that it invaded its dreams, causing its mites of features to twitch and quiver, so that it would have been a mercy to wake it." We have no room for the details of the visit to this wretched haunt.

The fourth chapter passes from infants to working boys, their "drudgery and privations, their temptations," &c. In every poor London district there is a "penny gaff," an illegal theatre expressly for children. The plays appeal to the most natural taste of young people, the taste for adventure, and enlist it on the side of vice, for the heroes are thieves, the heroines prostitutes. The author gives a graphic account of the details of a visit to one of these hideous dens, for which we must refer to his volume.

We now follow him to the second curse, "Professional Thieves." "Statistics," he says, "show that one person in a hundred and fifty among us is a forger, a housebreaker, a pickpocket, a shop-lifter, a receiver of stolen goods, or what not, a human bird of prey, in short." "No life," he adds, "is more miserable than this."

"Anybody would think, to hear 'em talk," a thief once remarked to me, "that it was all sugar with us while we were free, and that our sufferings did not begin till we were caught and 'put away.' Them that think so know nothing about it. Take a case now, of a man who is for getting his living 'on the cross,' and who has got a 'kid' or two, and their mother at home. I don't say that it is my case, but you can take it so if you like. She isn't a thief. Ask her what she knows about me, and she'll tell you that, worse luck, I've got in co. with some bad 'uns, and she wishes I hadn't. She wishes I hadn't, p'raps, not out of any sort of Goody Twoshoes feeling, but because she loves me. That's the name of it; we haint got any other name for the feelin'; and she can't bear to think that I may any hour be dragged off, for six months or a year, p'raps. And them's my feelings, too, and no mistake, day after day, and Sundays as well as week days. She isn't fonder of me than I am of her, I'll go bail for that; and as for the kids, the girl especially, why I'd skid a waggon wheel with my body, rather than her precious skin should be grazed. Well, take my word for it, I never go out in the morning, and the young 'un sez 'good bye,' but what I think, 'good bye—yes! p'raps it's good bye for a longer spell than you're dreaming about, you poor little shaver.' And when I get out into the street, how long am I safe? Why, only for the straight length of that street, as far as I can see the coast clear. I may find a stopper at any turning or at any corner. And when you do feel a hand on your collar! I've often wondered what must be a chap's feelings when the white cap is pulled over his peepers, and old Calcraft is pawing about his throat, to get the rope right. It must be a sight worse than the *other* feeling, you'll say. Well, if it is, I wonder how long the chap manages to hold up till he's let go!" (p. 90.)

This, the writer says, was really said to himself, "not by an incarcerated rogue, plying 'gammon,' as the incarcerated rogue loves to ply it," but by "a thief in possession of liberty." He adds: "I never saw the adage, 'suspicion always haunts the guilty mind,' so painfully illustrated as in the thieves' quarter, by the faces of grey-haired criminals, whose hearts had been worn into hardness by the dishonouring chains of transportation."

He paints with great force the extreme difficulty of the position of a convicted thief on leaving prison; the almost impossibility of his recovering himself, however hearty may be his wish to do so. He believes that one main obstacle to his recovery is that "they have no faith in the sincerity, honesty, or goodness of human nature"; "they believe people in general to be no better than themselves, and that most people will do a wrong thing if it serves their purpose." He protests against the proposal that they should be branded before leaving prison, and that the mark should be taken as proof of a former conviction. He wholly, and we think on good grounds, throws overboard Lord Shaftesbury's account of the amount of gain made by thieves. In discussing this he goes back to a subject which would have come more naturally under his first head—the juvenile thieves, many of them brought up by their fathers to the trade. He rather weakens this part of his subject, in our opinion, by bringing in, in the middle of his discussion of it, the subject of dishonest traders, adulterators of food, &c. That many of these are quite as bad as professional thieves, perhaps worse, and with much less excuse, we are very sure. But the nature of their temptations, their actual position before the law, and the means which may be used to stop the evil, are so wholly different, that by mixing them together he makes it, we think, more difficult for his readers to consider what practical method can be adopted to lessen the number of "professional thieves" in London. Two very important practical remarks he does make; the first is, that expense is no real reason against adopting any method which really promises to succeed, because the present system of leaving the professional thieves to prey upon society when they are at liberty, and from time to time seizing, trying, and imprisoning them, really costs more in mere money than any plan which can be adopted to meet the evil. The other is Lord Romilly's suggestion (how far our author supports it we are not sure), that the children of professional thieves should be taken from them for education.

One most important subject, which he places in quite a new light, is that our laws, as at present administered, tolerate the existence of a whole literature, the almost avowed object of which is to inspire boys and girls with the desire to become thieves. A year ago, he says, he "fished in one day, out of one little news-vendor's shop situated in the nice convenient neighbourhood of Clerkenwell, which, more than any other quarter of the metropolis,

is crowded with working children of both sexes, *twenty-three* samples of this gallows literature, all 'thrilling romances addressed to boys, and circulated entirely among them—and girls.'" The articles before him contained "The Skeleton Band," "Tyburn Dick," "The Black Knight of the Road," "Dick Turpin," "The Boy Burglar," and "Starlight Sall." He adds:—"It is altogether a mistake, however, to suppose that the poison-publisher's main element of success consists in his glorification of robbers and cut-throats. To be sure he can by no means afford to dispense with the ingredients mentioned in the concoction of his vile brew, but his first and foremost reliance is on lewdness. Everything is subservient to this." The author goes on to show this as far as can be done without tainting his book, which he avoids with laudable care. And he concludes by asking what security any man can have that such papers may not come into the hands even of his own children, considering that "at least a quarter of a million of these penny numbers are sold weekly," and that even "in quiet, suburban neighbourhoods, far removed from the stews of London and the pernicious atmosphere they engender; in serene and peaceful semi-country towns, where genteel boarding-schools flourish, there may almost invariably be found some small shopkeeper, who" weekly circulates them to "well-dressed little customers."

We have no space to enlarge upon the remaining "curses," as we have on the two first. They are "Professional Beggars," "Fallen Women," "Drunkenness," "Betting Gamblers," and the "Waste of Charity." The passages we had marked under these heads are no less important than those we have already quoted, but for them we must refer our readers to the book itself. To one point only we must call attention. He says:—"Whatever differences of opinion may arise as to the extent and evil operation of the other curses that affect the city of London in common with other great cities, no sane man will contest the fact, that drunkenness has wrought more mischief than all other social evils put together." This statement, of course, we are accustomed to see everywhere. But our author calls special attention to the fact, that "for one victim to alcohol, two might be reckoned who have 'come to their death-bed' through the various poisons which it is the publican's custom to mix with his liquors to give them a fictitious strength and fire"; and then follow some pages devoted to a mere list of the poisons which our poorer fellow-subjects are daily consuming under the name of beer. We are sure that this subject deserves much more attention than it has yet received, not merely as a financial or sanitary question, nor merely as a fraud which ought to be punished, but even more as one which causes extensive moral evil. Why is it, that the working classes of England are so much more in danger of getting drunk upon beer than those of France, Italy, Spain, &c., upon wine? Drunkenness, no doubt, is the special

temptation of northern countries. Let that fact, however, account for the mischief wrought by gin. Beer is not, any more than wine, to be classed with ardent spirits. Yet the effects of beer in England are confessedly far worse than those of wine in France. We believe the real explanation of this to be its adulteration. It is by drinking, at first in moderation, adulterated beer, that the habit of intoxication becomes a slavery, by which men are afterwards led into the abuse of gin. There are at this moment thousands of habitual drunkards around us, who would never have been drunkards if they had not been betrayed into the snare by drinking, in moderation, adulterated beer—that is, if the beer sold in public-houses were not adulterated. We insist upon this, because it is an evil which the law might uproot; and to allow the continuance of which is to suffer a pit to be dug, and then artfully covered over, in the very path of our labouring classes. That a very large proportion of the drunkenness of England is to be attributed to this cause is proved, we think, by the fact that in Germany, where the climate tempts at least as strongly to this vice as it does here, it is by no means so common, one chief difference between the two countries being that the common drink of the working classes there is a weak, unadulterated beer. This evil at least, law, well administered, might meet. At this moment the great diminution of the number of beer-houses which we trust Mr. Gladstone's Government will make, can hardly be opposed except on the ground of vested interests. Why, at least, should it not be enacted, as the penalty on conviction for selling adulterated beer, that the keeper of the house should be disqualified to hold a license, and the house itself disqualified from being licensed? No man certainly can have acquired a vested interest in any right to cheat or poison his neighbours, else nothing could be more unjust than our "Habitual Criminals Act," the very idea of which is to prevent the commission of theft by men who have, by long custom, acquired a "vested interest" in it. Under such a law as we suggest, it would be to the interest of the owners of these houses (very generally brewers) to see that their tenants did not poison their customers. And, considering the advanced state of chemical science among us, it is absurd to suppose that if the Government was determined that so it should be, the selling of adulterated beer might easily be made so dangerous a trade as to be very soon given over. We believe that no one measure would do more to lessen the national curse of drunkenness.

But, alas! although details like this are not to be neglected, how little, after all, can legislation do towards the removal of these "seven curses"! Here it is that Mr. Greenwood's book is disappointing. It is like the roll of the Prophet, written within and without; full of "lamentation and mourning and woe." We do not see how any decent person can read it without feeling ashamed

of his own daily comforts and pleasures, when he considers the lot of so many thousands of his countrymen—"his own flesh and blood" (as Mr. Gladstone said), and when it is brought home to him (as it is by Mr. Greenwood), that these outcasts of society are so far from being unmixedly evil, that, degraded as they are, there are still in them many, very many, redeeming qualities; and still more, that most of them seem not so much to have chosen evil as to have been thrown, by the conditions of our social system, into temptations and disadvantages so great, that he can hardly flatter himself, that, in their place, he would have been better than they.—Can he be certain he would not have been worse?

But the question which forces itself upon every man thus put to shame, is, How may such a social system be cured? and this immediately suggests another, How did it arise?

It is the natural result of the accumulation of a vast population within a small space; and this, again, is a necessary effect of a rich and complicated state of society. Extreme poverty and gross ignorance no doubt very greatly tend to promote it; and wise legislation will, as far as possible, limit and counteract them. But no legislation, however wisely framed upon the most certain principles of political economy, will do more than alleviate the curses of our social system. To alleviate them as far as may be is no doubt a duty incumbent (in proportion to their opportunities) on all whom the Providence of God has invested with any political power. But we must make up our minds to the fact that no past legislation could have prevented, and no future legislation can cure the existing evil. Even if in time we should succeed in preventing the existence of gross ignorance, it is certain that poverty at least will always exist. Neither are poverty and ignorance its causes. It has its root in the first principles of human nature, which are not changed by education and comparative well-being, although these tend to limit their exercise. It is also worth consideration that these principles have more free action in a state of society like ours, in which all classes enjoy personal freedom, than under that of the civilized nations of antiquity, in which the legislator and the moralist concerned himself only with the free citizens, the minority of the whole, while the mass of the working classes, being slaves, were under the strict discipline of their respective owners. Considering these things, we cannot doubt that the natural tendency of a high and complicated civilization like ours is to produce a large class, which is, on the whole, the worse, not the better, for it; and that, although wise government may lessen the evil, it cannot cure it.

Must we conclude, then, that nothing more can be effected than some alleviation, greater or less, of the existing evil? Assuredly not. All professed Christians acknowledge the existence and operation in the world of two great classes of principles, the natural and the supernatural. Political economy, intellectual development and

the like, deal only with the natural. Experience has proved that they are incompetent to meet the evil. The truly strange thing is, that any one who believes Christianity to be true, however imperfectly he may know it, should have thought it possible that they should. Is it likely, *à priori*, that Almighty God should have provided, at so great a cost, the vast machinery of supernatural graces and motives, if, after all, natural principles by themselves were enough to regulate all the momentous relations of man with his fellows? It is, therefore, only what we must have expected, that any social system which practically trusts only to natural causes and principles, in operating upon the mass of a people, should develop a wholly morbid state of society.—And what we might have inferred experience amply confirms.

If the experience of all ages is sufficient to teach any practical lesson, it is, that the natural tendency of society, if left to itself, and not renewed by any supernatural principle of life, is to advance from a rough and uncultivated state, in which the harsher and more rigid public virtues are developed, to one of more refined civilization, cultivation, and wealth, and as soon as that has been attained to begin to decay, to fall more and more into luxury and self-indulgence, and finally to perish by its own corruptions. In our own day, indeed, from whatever cause, men take for granted the exact contrary to this, that the natural tendency of society is to be always changing for the better. Hence has come into use the very word “progress,” which is so commonly employed among us, that one supposes the newspapers must keep it stereotyped to be ready for all occasions. In all former ages of the world men have taken for granted, that the natural tendency of wealth and prosperity to increase is more than counteracted by a tendency of the national morals to become in all prosperous states ever more and more corrupt; and that as civilization and prosperity increase this corruption increases in an ever accelerated proportion, until it leads to an irremediable decay. What the Roman historian considered as the special moral to be derived from the study of Roman history, the ancient moralists, philosophers, and statesmen believed to be the natural, nay, unavoidable fate of every prosperous country. “*Ad illa quisque intendat animum; quæ vita, qui mores fuerint per quos viros, quibusque artibus, domi militiæque, et partum et auctum imperium sit. Labente deinde paullulum disciplina, velut desidentes primò mores sequatur animo, deinde ut magis magisque lapsi sint, tum ire cœperint præcípites: donec ad hæc tempora, quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus, perventum est.*”

And, assuredly, the experience of the ancient world, as far as it went, confirmed the opinion. Prosperity led to indulgence, and indulgence to more insatiable desires, until nations in which poverty and simplicity had originally been held in honour, came

to regard wealth and pleasure as the only things really desirable, or even respectable. It was not that men, as individuals, ceased to believe that self-denial, and a preference for virtue above pleasure, was most beneficial, nay, necessary, for the good of nations; but each man felt that for himself pleasure was preferable to self-sacrifice, and that while the effect which could be produced upon his country by his own individual virtues or vices would be but a drop in the ocean, his individual interests were what really concerned him. Hence men like Sallust, and afterwards Seneca, while never tired of lauding the ancient maxims of the Roman Republic, indulged themselves to the utmost in the accumulation and enjoyment of all modern luxuries. What is most remarkable is that, as far as we are aware, there is no instance of any heathen nation, in which this process of corruption, having once begun, was stayed by any reaction, or return to ancient strictness. Nor is this wonderful; for the voice of conscience, which bore testimony that virtue was higher and nobler than pleasure, was easily silenced, and when men once came to deliberate and reason which of the two they should choose, the cause had already been gained for that side which could appeal to their senses, against that which had for its support only their instinctive feelings. Apparently, therefore, the ancients were not mistaken in believing it to be a general rule of society, that as the means of gratification increased, the desire for pleasure increased with it at a continually accelerated rate, and that the decay of morals and manners more than counterbalanced the advancement in wealth and prosperity.

For ourselves, however, we must profess a strong confidence that this method of reasoning does not apply to modern, that is, to Christian civilization. The tendency of increasing wealth to generate self-indulgence and corruption, is no doubt as strong as ever, but it has against it, not a mere instinct, whose voice is easily silenced amid the bustle of business and pleasure, but maxims which have for generations been admitted as first principles by the whole nation, which are taught, as certain indisputable fundamental truths, to every child from its very cradle, which are enforced in the sacred books which form the basis of the national morals and religion, and are set before all who pay any attention to their religion, in the life, example, and death, not only of the first teachers of Christianity, but, far more, of Him to Whom they gave witness. All this tends to give an advantage to the good cause when the contest comes on between the corrupting power of wealth and luxury on the one side, and on the other the maxims of contentment with little, self-denial, and the superiority of virtue over wealth, which it was quite impossible it should have in a heathen nation. And all this exists even in a Protestant nation, unless indeed, the tradition of Christianity has quite died out in it. A Catholic nation has, in addition to all these, that which affects the

national mind far more than all, the spectacle before its eyes of great institutions founded upon these maxims, and of multitudes of men and women voluntarily choosing for themselves a method of life, which, if they were not unquestionably true, or were not firmly and practically believed, would be utterly unreasonable and absurd; who, "whether they remain in seclusion, or are sent over the earth, have calm faces, and sweet plaintive voices, and spare frames, and gentle manners, and hearts weaned from the world, and wills subdued; and for their meekness meet with insult, and for their purity with slander, and for their gravity with suspicion, and for their courage with cruelty, yet meet with Christ everywhere—Christ, their all-sufficient everlasting portion, to make up to them, both here and hereafter, all they suffer, all they dare for His Name's sake."* No one who considers how much more men are practically influenced by seeing others manifestly and undeniably acting upon any principles, and risking everything upon their truth, than upon any enforcement of them, however reiterated logical and eloquent, can doubt that the visible example of a whole class of people, voluntarily choosing poverty, self-denial, and the abandonment of their own liberty of will and of family ties, must be a practical answer to the arguments and example of all the worshippers of wealth and pleasure to which no other answer could be compared. The lives of the Saints, which make so large a part of the reading of all Catholic countries, receive their explanation and evidence from these visible examples, and in their turn perpetually set before the people their real meaning and principle.

We reply, then, to the question put a few pages back—whether we must be content to leave these curses of our social system unremoved, but only to a small degree mitigated by wise legislation—that very much may be done towards their removal, if supernatural principles and agencies are really brought to bear upon them. Can we say, that, as yet, this has been so far done in London that we could reasonably expect from them any perceptible result?

We have already shown that we are disposed to give full weight to the real difference which exists between a Protestant population from which the practical sense of the supernatural has not died away, and a heathen land. Many of our countrymen assuredly, and many more of our countrywomen, are not merely in theory, but to a very great extent in practice, directed, controlled, and ruled by the supernatural truths which are brought before them especially in the New Testament. Among a large number of the gentry, the portion of truth taught in the Anglican Communion, with all its corruptions, produces its fruit. How else could so many of its members within the last few years have made enormous

* Newman's Sermons on Subjects of the Day, page 291, edition 1869.

sacrifices to become Catholics? Many no doubt still remain in that house of bondage, some of whom may never, in this world, find their way out of it. Nothing of this do we doubt. But what influence has the Anglican Establishment, what influence could it conceivably have, upon the class which supplies the thieves, beggars, and paupers, the baby-farmers and abandoned women, who form the curses of London? The first condition for coming under its influence is and has always been, respectability; and although one small section within it has lately attempted, among other imitations of the Catholic Church, to do something among the abandoned classes of London, we much doubt whether it has really influenced half a score of them. When we have made all possible allowance for this and for whatever may have been done by Protestant dissenters, we feel that to measure the degree to which any supernatural system has really been brought to bear upon these classes, would greatly resemble the task which our men of science have lately imposed upon themselves—that of measuring the degree of heat supplied to the earth by a fixed star. As to the Catholic Church, it is but yesterday that it has had liberty to act, and although it will never act even for a day without doing something for these classes, yet, in England, its power has hitherto been so much limited by the poverty of the mass of its members, and by the disproportion of the number of its Priests to the work it has to do among poor Catholics alone, that its missionary powers are still very limited.

The simple truth then is, that while millions, including vast multitudes of poor and uneducated persons, have been rapidly attracted to London, no attempt has really been made to bring to bear upon them that supernatural system, in the absence of which the wisest politicians of antiquity felt that corruption and decay were the unavoidable consequences of such accumulations of population, which, by the infinite mercy of God, has since been granted to us, which England, three centuries ago, possessed, and of which, alas! her then rulers unjustly and wickedly deprived not only the men of their own day but their children after them.

Long and deeply-rooted prejudices have already been much shaken by the historical investigations of late years, and by increased knowledge as to the practical working of the Catholic Church and of her institutions. Still, we fear that English people will still find it difficult to imagine how directly and powerfully those institutions would have operated, to prevent the formation of the criminal classes which now endanger society among us. To take a single instance—that of the neglected children for whom Mr. Greenwood pleads so pathetically. Can any man seriously doubt, that, if England had been Catholic, men and women in abundance would have been found to devote themselves to their rescue? It would, no doubt, have needed a vast number of persons

dedicated to educational orders, to gather out of the streets both boys and girls, and many orphanages to adopt and train abandoned children, and others for whom the guardianship of their parents is far worse than none. But yet, numerous as these classes actually are in London, it is certain, that if at this moment the mass of our population were Catholic, vocations would be found sufficient to supply all the labourers of both sexes necessary for their purposes. But, of course, if there had existed, say in A.D. 1600, A.D. 1700, and A.D. 1800, institutions sufficient to absorb and train the juvenile population of these days, that vast multitude of neglected children would never have accumulated, which now presses upon our rates and throngs our streets, preparing for the next generation a criminal population larger even than that which is the bane of our own, to be dealt with, as it may be, a few years hence. Gigantic as are the dimensions which the evil has now attained, it would even now be successfully coped with, even by that portion of our countrymen who take a real interest in religious works, if only, in labouring against it they had the help of those graces, which are given in the Catholic Church, and of the institutions which she everywhere produces. Much more would they have prevented its accumulation, had they been in operation to counteract it, before it had gathered strength and become inveterate. We mention the neglected children first, because it is plain that they are the seed of those poisonous plants which are year by year growing up around and amongst us, with a prolific energy ever more and more dangerous and perplexing; and we repeat it, that if the Catholic Church, instead of being persecuted and excluded, had been allowed free course in England for the last three centuries, this evil would never have grown up, and, even if that had been possible, would even now be speedily remedied.

It is not merely for the children of criminals, for deserted infants, and for those which now infest our streets almost like unowned dogs, that the charitable system of the Church is now needed, it is needed almost as much for the whole of that huge class of pauper children who throng our union workhouses.* It is most important that all who take an interest in such subjects should understand, that, in a union workhouse, any education worthy of the name is simply impossible. We have many good union schools, but those who most intimately know their working are aware, that the children, whether boys or girls, although well taught in them, scarcely leave the union before they return to it; the girls, in most cases, to be confined, the boys as unfit for any other station in life. The Catholic Church would soon provide places of education which would fit them for the work which lies before them.

* Mr. Greenwood states the number of pauper children at 350,000, but does not distinguish those in the union workhouses.

We are not speaking theoretically, we are stating only what experiment has already proved. A few years ago a young priest opened some schools, in one of the most hopeless districts of London, in the poorest and most neglected of the courts and alleys near Drury Lane. The children whom he gathered from the streets were the poorest, the most absolutely neglected of that neighbourhood. He obtained the assistance of some religious, and devoted himself wholly to the work. The children were not sent away to some rural district; many of them in a few years went out into the streets to pursue small trades, such as selling oranges, watercresses, &c. But he had convincing proofs that even in the midst of the temptations of such a calling, many were carefully preserving their purity and honesty. As vacancies occurred in the schools, fresh children pressed into them. The founder complained to the sisters that the school was changing its character. It had been intended for the poorest and most neglected classes, but now well-dressed decent children were taking their places. In reply, the sisters asked what was to be done, for these tidy children, who looked so well off, were of the same families, the brothers and sisters of those neglected ones whom the schools had gathered when they were first opened. Their different appearance was only the effect of the change in the habits of the whole family, which had already been wrought by the attendance at the school of the elder children. This institution, which consists of several distinct branches, schools for boys, for girls, for infants; and working classes in which young women make artificial flowers, &c., is still in full operation, although in other hands, for its founder was early called to his rest. Can we doubt, that if the self-devoting zeal and activity, which are no less characteristic of the English nation than its great wealth, had been brought to bear upon the work of Christianizing London, by means of the spiritual agencies which were brought to bear in this one instance, London would have been preserved from ever falling into the condition which Mr. Greenwood describes. What then would have been the effect if in every part of London there had been, not merely schools like this, founded and directed by the energy of a single priest, with the assistance merely of three or four nuns, but vast communities devoted wholly to the service of God, and of their neighbour, and who, by their own voluntary poverty would have raised the lot and refined the hearts of the poor? Mr. Greenwood, more than once, mentions it as the most hopeless symptom of the criminal classes, that they are wholly without belief in goodness, and almost incapable of being convinced that it exists. They believe that no one, however apparently virtuous and honest, is really any better than themselves; and the first difficulty to be overcome, by any one who attempts to benefit them, is to persuade them that he has not some sinister personal object in view. This

is a depth of degradation unknown in countries where the Catholic Church and her institutions have had free action. The poor find no difficulty in believing that those who profess to be their friends mean what they say, if they see that these very persons might, if they would, have enjoyed all that the world could give, but that they have voluntarily abandoned it all, in order to become sisters of charity or Christian brothers, or monks or friars. The very sight of communities such as these renews, even among the outcasts of society, the effect produced among men, by the mission and sufferings of "Him Who being rich for their sake became poor." Unreasonable as it may be thought, experience proves, that the same confidence is not inspired into the poorer classes by the sight of an Anglican Rector, however exemplary, living, with his affectionate wife and blooming well-dressed children, in some healthy open Square, and who is probably to be found at the seaside in the hot season, when "there is nobody in London."

This is but one illustration out of many, of the unquestionable fact, that if the Catholic Church and its institutions had been in possession of London during the last three centuries, the lamentable social condition which Mr. Greenwood so feelingly describes, could never have arisen among us. Much as we are tempted to do so, our limits forbid us to follow the subject into its details. One of these, however, we must beg our readers to consider. Among the most hopeless evils of the poor of London must be reckoned the miserable crowding of their habitations. It is not merely that a family, father, mother, and three or four children, are often lodged in one room; we have known cases in which one small room has been the sole dwelling-place of not less than four families. This evil, legislation has of late attempted to meet, and we trust that it is to a certain degree alleviated; yet, do what we may, it is certain that as long as extreme poverty exists, very many families must of necessity be crowded into most limited space. It is difficult to realize to ourselves the condition of a man at work all day in a shop or factory, or of a woman compelled to sit more than twelve hours out of the four-and-twenty, in a crowded work-room, and whose "home" is of this sort. It is certainly much under the mark to say, that there must be, in London, very many thousands of both sexes who, from the cradle to the grave, never know what it is to be for one moment alone. And yet, not to mention anything less sacred, no one surely will hesitate to place solitude and silence among the most indispensable conditions even of a low degree of the spiritual life. And now, by way of contrast, think for a moment, what must have been the condition of a working-man in London before the change of religion. The churches, as we all know, were so numerous that several hundred were crowded together in a space as nearly as possible equal to that of Hyde Park. How many

still remain any one may see, who looks at the City from the river, or from the opposite bank ; and yet, at three several epochs, great and very successful exertions have been made towards a wholesale diminution of their number—first, when all the conventual churches, probably at least half of the churches then existing, were destroyed under Henry VIII ; next, after the Great Fire, when less than half of those burnt down were rebuilt (the sites of the others being turned into those queer little burial-grounds, which we now see from the back windows of City banks and warehouses) ; and lastly, in our own time, when Bishop Blomfield obtained an act to authorize the demolition of several more, and the transfer of the endowments to support churches in those parts of London which are unprovided with them, because they have grown up since the nation and the government became Protestant. Of course no one can deny that, now and for the last three centuries, they are and have been (as Bishop Blomfield complained) wholly useless. In Catholic times, to say nothing of the great object for which they were built (the offering of that Blessed Sacrifice which makes the church “a heaven upon earth”), each of them was to every jaded, crowd-wearied man, woman, and child, in the highest sense of the word, a home. It was the House of his Father ; whither he could always pass at any moment from the crowd and bustle of city life into the calm, solemn, silent society and converse of his Lord and Master, his Saviour and Redeemer, the light of his eyes, the life of his soul ; in which he was always welcome, and always sure to find stillness, order, and peace. Specially valuable in this respect, as in many others, was that “superfluous decking of churches” which the inventors of the new religion instinctively felt to be quite inconsistent with their whole system, and which therefore the Anglican Church has denounced in a special homily, composed and published by authority. This homily vehemently condemns, not merely the use of images “decked with gold and silver, painted with colours, set with stone and pearl, and clothed with silks and precious vestures” (against images of course the superstitious feeling of those days was specially directed) ; but, also apart from this, “the adorning the Temple and House of God, fancying that all people should be more moved with the due reverence of the same, if all corners thereof were glorious, and glistening with gold and precious stones.” This is, not inconsistently, condemned, on the ground that the true use of churches is for the preaching of sermons, for public prayers, and administration of the sacraments “at times appointed.” It was therefore evidently the deliberate intention of the founders and apostles of the Anglican communion that the churches of London should be used only, as they have actually been used during the last three centuries, for public worship, and should at other times be left empty ; and they felt, very reasonably, that the

"superfluous decking," which they denounce, was useless for this purpose, and might lead to their being used for other purposes. The passage is valuable as the testimony of eye-witnesses, to the state in which these multitudinous churches actually were before the change of religion. Not to mention the first object of all this beauty and gorgeousness—the glory of God and of His House—its value can hardly be over-estimated as a direct means of education to those whose hours of quiet, silence, and calm could be habitually spent only in them. The dwellings of the very poor, especially in a great city, must always be not only crowded, but gloomy and dingy. It has often been remarked that, in some favoured districts, the labouring class gains a very valuable sort of education from living among the great and beautiful works of nature—the sea, mountains, forests, and the like. From such things the poor in a city, such as London, are of necessity cut off. Light, brightness, and cheerfulness, such as it is, they now see, as a general rule, only in gin-palaces or penny theatres, such as Mr. Greenwood describes. When the churches were "decked" in the manner condemned by the Anglican Church (in those homilies which every Anglican clergyman solemnly declares to contain "a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times"), every man, rich and poor, found them almost exclusively in the churches. Private houses were in general less spacious and open than those of our day.

*Privatus illis census erat levis,
Commune magnum.*

But the home of all, upon which so much was lavished, was the House of their common Father. What the gorgeous halls of the *Thermæ* were to the poor citizen of Rome, whose private dwelling was very small and confined, that the churches seem to have been to the citizen of Catholic London; and thus beauty, brightness, and light, painting and sculpture became associated with his best and holiest thoughts and feelings.

In these days we are wholly unaccustomed to observe the effect of things like this upon the mass of the poor, for they have no access to them; and owing chiefly, we believe, to this fact, it has come to be supposed that the mass of the English people are incapable of appreciating works of art and objects of beauty. This, we are certain, is nothing more than a vulgar error. Among all nations, in every rank and every age, such tastes require to be developed by cultivation; and for three centuries, owing to the influence of Puritanism, they have been absolutely and wholly smothered among the English people. As late as the time of George III. Sir Joshua Reynolds found it impossible to persuade Anglican dignitaries that painting and sculpture were not anti-Christian. But that the faculty exists in abundant, perhaps in a

very unusual measure among the English people, is capable of the clearest proof. Without entering on the subject at length, we would mention the development of the arts among the Flemings and Hollanders—the people of Europe nearest to the English in blood and language,—and the marvellous beauty of many works of art produced before the change of religion for English churches and by English artists. To say nothing of architecture, nor again of the ancient decoration of our cathedrals, paintings which fully bear out this estimate are every now and then discovered in some village church, when the whitewash of the Anglican reformers is removed. These things would never have been produced if there had been no demand for them in the national taste, and their educational effect on the people must have been similar to that which Lord Macaulay very truly says must have been produced among the citizens of Athens from “daily walking among the friezes of Phidias and the paintings of Zeuxis.”

Surrounded as we are with a vast population of Catholics, the poorest of the poor, we are now almost of necessity compelled to limit ourselves, even in the building of Catholic churches, to the necessary accommodation of our congregations; and hence we have hardly any experience of the effect upon the English poor of churches such as those with which old London was crowded. Yet some idea may be formed by any one who watches the number of persons, many of them belonging to the working class, who come every evening to the church of the Oratory at Brompton, which, while wholly without the least pretensions to architectural beauty, attracts them by brightness, incense, and colour, as well as by musical services and sermons. It is needless to say, in a Catholic Review, that there is something there far better than all these things, but in former days That was to be found also in every London church. On the whole, we do not think we overstate the matter when we say that even if we did not rely upon the effect of the direct teaching and public worship of the Catholic Church, and upon the power of her institutions, no city which was full of churches adorned and inviting worshippers as those of London once did, could possibly have sunk to the social state in which London now is.

It may perhaps be thought, that to bring the Catholic system to bear upon the mass of the inhabitants of London, would have been difficult, on the ground of costliness, and this the more naturally, because the cost is confessedly one of our greatest difficulties at the present day. But it must be remembered that our present condition is wholly unnatural and exceptional. A very large proportion of the very poorest of the poor are Catholics; while among the wealthier classes, Catholics, much as they have been increased by the conversions of the last thirty years, are hardly more than a sprinkling. In estimating what London would have been but for

the change of the national religion, we have of course supposed the rich as well as the poor to have retained the ancient Faith. But, in truth, even this would not have been necessary in order to provide for the expense of keeping London Christian, if the property voluntarily given by its owners in past times for that express purpose had not been diverted to other uses. Take, for instance (what was, after all, only a fragment of the property devoted in London to the service of the Catholic religion), the portion now held by the Duke of Bedford and by the Protestant dignitaries of S. Paul's. We feel no doubt that this alone would have been abundantly sufficient to maintain religious communities in every part of London, on the largest, most liberal, and most efficient scale, and to have provided churches for the new parts of London. Those parts which were built before the change of religion would have needed none, for they were abundantly supplied.

It seems, then, that for the purpose of keeping London Christian it would not have been necessary that the Catholic Church should have drawn upon the English nation for a single farthing. As far as property was concerned, all that was necessary was, that the nation, acting by its government, should not have applied to other purposes the whole of the property freely given by its owners in Catholic times for that object. To what purposes it actually was applied history informs us, and, indeed, we may partly see it before our eyes. Mr. Hallam, indeed, argues* that, as the "most considerable families within and without the bounds of the peerage will be found, with no great number of exceptions, first to have become conspicuous under the Tudor line of kings, and to have acquired no small portion of their estates from monastic and other ecclesiastical foundations, it is better that those revenues should from age to age have been expended thus," rather than on the objects for which they were given. We do not wish to undervalue the importance of the public services rendered by the Dukes of Bedford. Still it may be questioned whether they have been, on the whole, more important than that of keeping the social condition of London Christian, instead of allowing it to sink into its present condition. On such subjects, probably, men will always differ.†

* Constitutional History, chap. ii. We have compressed the quotation.

† It is hardly a digression to observe that Leeds is another of the huge towns which form the difficulty and reproach of our social system. It is built in great measure upon the lands of the abbey of Kirkstall. The lands of this abbey were conveyed, at the time when Cranmer could do pretty much what he liked, "to a relation of his own, one Roger Cranmer." Who owns those lands now we do not know. Stripe says that Cranmer also obtained for his own family the tithes of the parish of Aslacton, the place which had the honour to give him birth. We presume this is the same which figures in the "Clergy List" as a vicarage with 359 souls, and £58 endowment, most of which probably has been since derived from Queen Anne's

Our own conclusion then is, that the present social and moral condition of London results from the change of religion in the sixteenth century, and could never have existed if the old religion had been maintained. No thoughtful man, we imagine, will deny its direct tendency to prevent such a state of things. But we shall not be surprised to hear it argued that the curses of London are the necessary result, not of the Protestant Reformation, but of modern civilization, and result from causes which not even the old religion would have availed to counteract, and that accordingly they exist in Catholic as well as Protestant countries. In support of this argument Paris is commonly referred to, and is no doubt the most plausible instance. We have not here space to enter fully into the subject, but we must not wholly pass it by. First, then, it is wholly a mistake to suppose that there are any classes in Paris at all similar to the degraded population of London. It is true there is in Paris a very formidable class. Too many of its working population, though by no means brutalized, and indeed possessing a considerable amount of intellectual development, have learned to reject revelation and to believe that the evils of modern society must be met by a complete social revolution. This class constitute no doubt a real danger to society, but nothing except the blindest prejudices could lead any man to confuse it with that of the neglected children, professional thieves, fallen women and others who are the curse of London. If more degraded, it would be less dangerous, because less powerful. As education is more widely extended among our people, a class like this may become numerous in London; for it is a most natural result of the system of giving education without religion to men pressed down by the weight of modern civilization. But should it arise, it will be made doubly dangerous by the existence in close contact with it of that other more degraded class which is our present misery. That it has arisen in Paris, so far from being any answer to our argument as to the natural tendency of the Catholic religion, in truth strongly confirms it. For in France the Catholic system has, in very many respects, been swept away ever since 1789, and is now only

bounty. It has been common for great prelates to found charities, or in some other way to benefit the place of their birth. We imagine the particular way selected by Cranmer to be without example. It is curious to observe the change of feeling among Protestants with regard to Cranmer and his fellows. A very few years ago, a dignitary, still living—Archdeacon Churton—in his splendid work on the “Yorkshire Abbeys,” wrote:—“As it is certain that the leaders of the Reformation are not accused of having enriched themselves, one would rather leave this single act [as to Kirkstall Abbey] under the obscurity in which it rests, than deduce from it any conclusion unfavourable to the personal integrity of Cranmer.” It is amusing to compare this tone with that now employed by Protestants upon such subjects.

struggling to regain its influence. Our argument is that it is especially by means of the religious orders that the Catholic religion works upon the poor. But in France the religious orders were swept away eighty years ago. The Count of Montalembert tells us that he himself saw the religious habit for the first time upon the stage. Under such a system how could it or its wearers be known to the working classes of Paris? Again, it is by education that the Catholic Church most directly Christianizes the labouring classes. But, for near a century the French Government has taken education into its own hands, and it is not too much to say that in general it has been wielded with the deliberate intention of excluding Christianity. Even at times when there has been reason to hope that this was not desired by the actual government, the possession enjoyed by the system of irreligious education has been so strong that they have been able to do nothing effectual to counteract it. Lastly, although the Catholic Church, unlike some other societies, does not rely upon money for its working upon the poorer classes, still worldly means are necessary as an instrument in approaching them. But money has for near a century been almost as absolutely wanting to the Church in France as in England itself.

It may be objected that when we refuse to acknowledge France since the Revolution as a fair specimen of the social effects of the Catholic religion, we do not go back far enough; for we may be asked, How is it that the Catholic religion did not avail to render such a revolution impossible? We reply that the government of France, under the old *régime*, had long ceased to be Catholic. No one who has read M. Gérin's work on the Assembly of 1682, and especially the chapter on "Church property under Lewis XIV.," can fail to feel that the whole influence of that absolute government was directed to undermine the religion of the higher classes, both of clergy and laity, and that the endowments of the Church were systematically employed in that godless work. It would be unjust to attribute this personally to the great monarch. His predecessors for more than a century had done even more in the same direction. At last things came to such a pass that the Revolution and the general spoliation of Church property, although producing in their more remote effects vast religious evil among the humbler classes, probably removed more evil than they caused among the higher classes both of laity and clergy. Thus, then, these social curses, so far as they exist in Paris, are the direct result of a falling away from the principles of the Catholic Church, not on the part of the people at large but on the part of the court and the monarch. And, although the evil took a different form, the abandonment of Catholic principles in France and in England is thus far to be traced to the same cause. In both it was caused by the irreligion and vices of absolute rulers

corrupting the court and aristocracy; in both the mass of the people were sufferers rather than doers of evil.

Alas! we must not stop here. It is only too evident, that, not in France alone, but throughout Catholic Europe, the administration of public affairs has long ceased to be Catholic. While, therefore, we see with thankfulness that in those countries the social state both of great cities and of country districts is immeasurably different from that which we have to deplore in England, the conclusion is forced upon us, that there are, and for years past have been, none in which Catholic principles have had free action, or to which we can look with any confidence for their full fruits. Considering the circumstances of Europe, it is only wonderful that the mass of the nation is still Catholic in life as well as conviction in so many countries in which the government is actively hostile. Northern Italy is one case in point. To the future it is not ours to look forward, but bad as things now are, we hopefully expect, that the Providence of God will bring out of the present confusion some new state of things, in which the Church, whose peculiar property it is to adapt herself to every condition of this changing world, will, in spite of all difficulties, find her place and do her work.

But our duties are with the present. And there are things which legislation may even now do. For instance, Mr. Greenwood, in two different parts of his volume, shows that licentious penny newspapers and journals are at present one of the main demoralizing agents. Any Catholic parliament would long ago have put a stop to that curse. In fact, we trust that, Protestant though they be, our present rulers will see the necessity of doing so. We hardly think that any party or any politician of ordinary decency can consider it a necessary part of our highly vaunted "freedom of the press" that men should be allowed to enrich themselves by publishing cheap papers for boys and girls, in which, although nothing is spared "for the glorification of robbers and cut-throats," yet, "the first and foremost reliance is on lewdness." Yet of this literature, our author says, at least a quarter of a million are sold weekly.

We have said that it is only by supernatural agency and motives that the curses of London can really and effectually be removed; that as things now are, no supernatural system is in any degree brought to bear upon the classes which supply the criminal population of London, and that it is by the Catholic Church alone that it can be applied to them. The only reason why the evil has in times past been allowed to grow up and obtain possession as it has, has been, because the Government of England, not content with leaving things alone, both deprived the Church of the property given to her for this very purpose by the piety of her children in times past, and also enforced, for more than two centuries, a code of persecuting

laws, which though they did not prevent her from the secret and concealed exercise of her mission, which hundreds of bloody martyrdoms failed to put down, made all public exercise of it simply impossible. By this means alone it was that things came into their present condition. Liberty has now been restored to her, but she has to overtake the great tide of evil which has accumulated and rushed on with unchecked fury, while the hands of the true Mother were tied, and while she was compelled to look on powerless from a distance upon her children, given over to the power of the enemy. Never before did Satan wage a persecution so successful. The work now to be done is indeed enormous, and the means of attempting it are, humanly speaking, very small. Yet we do not despair, for we cannot bring ourselves to believe that, unless God had purposes of mercy towards our country, so wonderful a resurrection of the Church among us as the last few years have witnessed could possibly have taken place. Let us then "thank God and take courage."

Oh that we had with us the help of all who ought to be on our side ! It is sad to think how many of our countrymen, who already see that our country and theirs can be saved only by bringing to bear upon it the principles of the one Catholic Church, continue to delude themselves with the vain hope that they may save it by working those principles in the bosom of a schismatical and heretical communion. What might we not hope to do, if all who desire the revival of Catholic principles of action were only united in the one Church in which alone their existence is possible ? It is ours to unite heartily in prayer for the enlightenment of these our deluded brethren, first, no doubt, for their own sake, and then for the sake of our country.

ART. II.—CHRONICLE OF EVESHAM ABBEY.

Chronicon Abbatie de Evesham ad annum 1418. Edited by WILLIAM DUNN MACRAY, M.A., Chaplain of Magdalene and New Colleges, and Assistant in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. London : Longman. 1863.

THE Master of the Rolls has rendered a very great service to all persons interested in the mediæval history of England, though that service may be, in the form it is given, somewhat incomplete. It is not in his power, even if it be his will, to employ the proper instruments : three hundred years of heresy, with its accompanying ignorance, have collected

a cloud over the ancient records which modern learning cannot disperse; at least that sort of learning which is at the command of the Master of the Rolls. The ability to read an old writing is not the only qualification desirable in an editor; and even the accomplishments of a modern education may prove a snare. But the grave difficulty with which men have to contend is the ignorance of ancient ways, as well as the ignoring of modern practices, which, though they may be unknown to most English scholars, are not unknown to those who pretend to no particular erudition. Thus, by way of illustration, we may instance Mr. Macray himself—a man not inferior to any of his colleagues, and superior to some of them—who says that an indulgence of a hundred days was granted to those who venerated the church of Evesham. If Mr. Macray had been in the habit of gaining, or of trying to gain, indulgences, a practice not uncommon among his countrymen and countrywomen, even in and around Oxford, he would have doubted the reading of his MS. before he allowed such a statement to appear in print. Not having seen his MS., we cannot tell whether he has read it correctly or not; but we feel some little confidence that, if he has, the scribe made a grave mistake. The indulgence was granted to those who visited the church, not to those who venerated it, whoever they may have been.*

This chronicle of the abbey of Evesham—the abbot was a peer of the realm—for which we are indebted to Mr. Macray, traces the history of the monastery from its foundation in the very beginning of the eighth century down to the beginning of the fifteenth. S. Egwyn, bishop of Worcester, moved by heavenly visions, established monks of the Order of S. Benedict in a waste and barren land, overrun with thorns and briars; but to-day and for many ages gone by, one of the most fruitful portions of fruitful England, the vale of Evesham.

S. Egwyn was bishop of Worcester, and his territorial rule extended over the desolate vale, but he procured from the Sovereign Pontiff a complete exemption from that rule for the rising monastery; the bishop of Worcester gave up the vale and its future inhabitants, and settled them with an independent jurisdiction, for which they were not accountable to anybody but to the Pope. This immunity finds no favour in the eyes of Mr. Macray, who says of it that it “proved so fertile in abuses, and formed at last so strong a link in the chain of causes which drew on the overthrow of the monastic system amongst us.”†

* “Concessit omnibus pœnitentibus et hanc ecclesiam venerantibus de pœnitentia sibi injuncta centum dies relaxationis.” Venerantibus may or may not be in the MS., but the bishop’s formula was *visitantibus* (p. 279).

† *Pref. p. i.*

Even if it were true that the exemption did all that is here laid to its charge, it is very little to the purpose; because exemptions are privileges which we need not discuss: they have been settled for many centuries by the supreme judge of bishops and abbots, and in this instance of the abbey of Evesham, it was the bishop of Worcester himself who barred his own rights.

In the course of time, as we shall see, the abbey had to fight for its privileges, but it never had to defend their lawfulness or even their expediency: the successors of S. Egwyn in the see of Worcester never disputed the exemptions as lawful in themselves, but they contended that the abbey had either lost them or had never possessed them. Neither does it appear that the ruin of monasteries was ever contemplated as a necessary consequence of independent abbeys. On the whole, bishops and abbots lived in peace; and if the world had not been troubled with other questions than that of exemption from episcopal or diocesan jurisdiction, it is just possible that the abbeys and their inmates might have been visible at this day.

For two hundred and forty years after its foundation the abbey of Evesham observed the rule of S. Benedict, peaceably governed by successive abbots, and in the possession of the endowments which S. Egwyn had given it or procured for it. S. Egwyn himself resigned his bishopric and became the abbot of the church he had founded. On the death of Eadwin, the nineteenth abbot, there was a reformer in the neighbourhood ready to do his work. He had his notions about divine service, and his theories about property, just as if he had been born six hundred years later. He was a great nobleman of Mercia, perhaps the subregulus, Alchelm by name. By some means or other he obtained a grant of the abbey from king Edmund, not the saint, as the chronicler is careful to tell us, and treated it as his property. The issue was that the monks were driven out, and secular canons introduced, who, as usual on occasions of this kind—and they were many in those days—accepted the abbey with diminished revenues: for the change was in the nature of a reform. These canons were expelled afterwards by S. Dunstan and S. Ethelwold, who restored the monks to their lawful home; the possessions of the abbey were also recovered, either from the chief robber himself or from his heirs and assigns.

After the death of king Edgar, who had in all matters relating to the religious houses cordially assisted S. Dunstan and S. Ethelwold, Elferus, earl of Mercia, seized upon the abbey, expelled the monks, and in their place substituted a few canons. He too was a reformer: he gave the lands of the abbey to his soldiers, and paid the priests who served the desolated

churches what he pleased. This nobleman, after a life of rapine, was seized with remorse when he came to die, and by way of restitution, gave the abbey to the monk Freodegar, who, when he went to take possession of the gift, was resisted by the canons and finally driven away. In this perplexity he made an exchange with one Godwin, lord of Towcester, who secured his bargain by obtaining a confirmation of it from Ethelred the king. The abbey and its possessions were now in the hands of men who cared nothing for the rule of S. Benedict, and the monks were excluded from it, to all appearances, for ever. In the beginning, however, of the eleventh century, king Ethelred sent a monk from Ramsey to the abbey, Aelfward by name, who, being a man of great resolution, rescued the church out of the hands of Godwin, and not only recovered most of its possessions, but re-established its exemption, which it had practically lost, from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Worcester, who had been himself, in an irregular way, one of the temporary owners of the plundered abbey. The powerful lords of Mercia were not the only persons whom the monks were in fear of in the matter of their lands: for those of a lower order in the state knew the value of broad acres as well as the great barons; and more than once did such people lay claim to fields and meadows, and go to law with the unhappy monks. One of these men living close by the abbey—*rusticus, et moribus agrestis*—entered upon the domains of the community, and held possession by violence, of the land he had stolen; he persisted in his purpose, and by dint of hard swearing carried on the process against the monks so far as to leave but one act undone previous to a formal sentence in his favour. The judges in the cause appointed a day for this man to appear before them on the land in question, and there to make oath that he believed it to be his own. On the day assigned the prior of Evesham, bearing the relics of S. Egwyn and accompanied by many of the monks, went forth, in sad procession, trusting no longer in human justice, but commending their cause to God and the saint their founder. The countryman also made his appearance, accompanied by a tumultuous rabble, who exulted in the anticipated plunder of the monks. He, too, had made his preparations: for he had covered the inner soles of his shoes with earth taken from land which was undoubtedly his own, and was therefore qualified to swear, when he stood on the lands of the monks, that he claimed the fields, which was true, and that he was standing on his own ground—also true.* He did not live to complete his perjury,

* "Sumpserat de domo sua pulverem, et eo subtalares suos impleverat, ut tuto jurare posset quod supra terram suam consisteret" (p. 43).

for a reaping-hook or scythe, which he held in his hands was so carelessly handled that it struck him on the head. The blow was so violent that it deprived him of life—to the terror of his friends, but to the relief of the abbey, for his iniquitous claim perished with him.

At the Conquest, when so many religious houses, as well as churches, of greater and of less reputation, felt heavily the mailed hand of the rapacious barons, who paid themselves out of the spoils of England, the church of Evesham happily escaped. The abbot Agelwy found favour in the eyes of the Conqueror, and not only protected his own abbey, but afterwards, as one of the judges, procured the restoration of many stolen manors to their rightful owners. It was at the close of the twelfth century that the abbey suffered most; and the story of its wrongs is the chief subject of the Chronicle which is now before us.

By the martyrdom and canonization of S. Thomas, the great monastic church of Canterbury acquired a new title to the reverence of Europe: pilgrims from all nations thronged the roads that led to it, and the monks of Christchurch, guardians of the shrine, became a power in the land. None felt this to be an inconvenience more keenly than Baldwin, the archbishop, who ought to have rejoiced in the splendours of his church, and in the renown it had purchased by the blood of the martyr on whose throne he sat, but of whose spirit he was not the heir. Baldwin had been himself a monk and an abbot, but as bishop of Worcester, and afterwards as archbishop of Canterbury, the only sign of his ancient profession was his oppression of the monks of Christchurch. Confederate with certain bishops who had always thwarted his martyred predecessor, he proposed to build a new church near Canterbury, and to endow it for secular canons. He endeavoured to hide his real intent by dedicating it to S. Stephen and S. Thomas; but the monks were not so simple as to enter the net prepared for them. They resisted the scheme; for it was neither more nor less than their eventual ruin. The archbishop proposed to make all the bishops prebendaries of the church; and even Henry II. himself was to have his stall in the new foundation, and to sing the office, at least by proxy. While the monks were striving to avert the degradation of the great church of Canterbury to the rank of an abbey of the second order, or, rather, of a priory, one of their number, Roger Norreys by name, betrayed the counsel of his brethren to the archbishop, and occasioned them greater trouble. When this was found out, the faithless brother was put in prison, out of which, however, he contrived to make his escape, through the sewers of the monastery, and into the court

of the archbishop. Baldwin received him gladly, and to the great consternation of the monks, sent him back to Christchurch as prior, in October, 1189. There was a tumult in the monastery, and armed men were sent to guard the approaches to it by the primate, who refused even their necessary food to the beleaguered monks whose rights and immunities were so greatly imperilled. There was a great agitation even in the court of king Richard, who had just been crowned; for the proceedings of the archbishop were considered to be too arbitrary even by his advisers. The king went down to Canterbury, where he was received by the convent, November 27th; and on that day and the next a reconciliation took place between the archbishop and the monks of Christchurch, but it was at the expense of the prior, Roger Norreys, whom his friend and patron, the archbishop, remorselessly deposed.

Roger was now a monk let loose on the world; and, as the chronicler of the abbey brands him, as *nullius monasterii monachus*. He belonged to no community, though he had taken vows, and had engaged to observe the rule of S. Benedict. But at this time the abbey of Evesham became vacant, and Baldwin, to his everlasting dishonour, persuaded Richard I. to seize on the patronage of the abbey and to send Roger thither as abbot, against the remonstrances of the monks.* Roger Norreys was now at his ease: having had some experience in the government of refractory monks, he knew how to deal with those who refused to submit to his rule. He was not tried at once at Evesham, for he appears to have lived peaceably with the convent for some years before he broke out and became a public scandal. He was an able man, though neither learned nor good; given to hospitality and a great talker, but destitute of the moral habits befitting his sacred profession. He neglected the rule, as he had always done; absented himself from choir, and wore certain articles of dress not lawful for a monk.

* Mr. Macray says that Roger became abbot of Evesham in 1191, and apparently proves the fact by stating that the predecessor of Roger died November 12, 1191. On the other hand, it is to be considered that Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, is severely blamed by Alan, abbot of Tewkesbury, for sending Roger to Evesham; Hoveden (p. 661) confirms this, and yet Baldwin died November 19, 1190, nearly a year before the abbot whom Roger succeeded. In the absence of more correct information, we believe that Roger was made abbot in 1189, or early in 1190. Perhaps the vacancy was occasioned by a resignation. Gervase (col. 1564) says that Roger was blessed by Baldwin; but the date 1191 is clearly wrong, Baldwin being then dead, and is a mistake of the scribe or of the printer, because the year 1189 is followed by 1191. This chronicle favours the earlier date; for, in p. 134, the Papal delegates find that Roger was blessed by William Northall, bishop of Worcester, who died May 3, 1190.

His mode of life, too, was expensive, and his hospitality was probably extended too frequently to the neighbouring barons. He ceased even to see his monks, and treated them, when he came in contact with them, with ostentatious contempt. He abused them by calling them names, and at last made them too intimately acquainted with hunger and thirst. He spent even the revenues of the community upon himself, not satisfied with the revenues of the abbot; and the monks were so poor that they were unable to get their necessary clothing. Many of them could not appear in choir, so shabby had their garments become; while their food was too frequently brought down to bread and water. It was hard to bear, but bear it they did, however, though they longed to feed on what the abbot gave to his servants; and yet there was none to give them even what the meanest of his servants rejected.

In this strait the monks petitioned the archbishop of Canterbury, Hubert Walter, as legate of the Holy See and protector of the abbey. The legate heard their complaints, and gave them relief; but, on the expiration of the archbishop's legatine powers, Roger returned to his ancient ways, and famine reigned in the abbey once more. The abbot gave grand dinners to the Chief Justice of the kingdom, and entertained the barons with lavish hospitality; but the poor monks had not even the satisfaction of eating the crumbs that fell from the abbot's table, though they were the principal contributors to the cost of that display. But all this time they were not asleep; they were watching Roger, tracking his path, and spying out his secret enormities. For this some of them were expelled the monastery, others were imprisoned; but after all, says the chronicler, "we always, by the help of God, came out of his hands alive, though it may be said that some of us died for want of necessary food."

They appealed again to the archbishop, who came down to Evesham, but to no great purpose, for the monks failed, for want of sufficient resolution, to make good their case. The abbot, by himself, or by his friends, prevailed upon some of the brethren to relax in their efforts, and the result was, as usual, that a divided house cannot stand. The archbishop returned, the abbot kept his place, and the poor monks were reduced to greater straits than they had ever been in before. The abbot, without learning or even decency, succeeded in his cause, because he knew his own mind, and was able to win over some of the weaker monks, if not to espouse his quarrel, at least not to oppose him, with the necessary firmness.

In this deplorable condition of the monastery Malgerus, bishop of Worcester, compassionating its condition, obtained

from Innocent III. powers to visit all the churches subject to his jurisdiction within the diocese, and to make such corrections therein as should be necessary, from which there should be no appeal. It is plain from the story, and admitted by the chronicler, that the bishop was in good faith; he really believed that the abbey was subject to his authority. He sent word to Evesham that he should arrive on a certain day to make his visitation. When the abbot received this notice, he replied, "He shall be welcome"; for he thought nothing of it, and regarded the bishop's visitation as a visit of common politeness, which he intended to accept and treat as such. But those who were with the abbot saw more in the matter than he did, and began to discuss its real significance. After a time they sent for Thomas of Marlborough, one of the younger monks, learned in the law, and asked him to explain the force of the bishop's words. Thomas, without hesitation, told them that the bishop proposed to visit the abbey as its superior, and ended by saying that the convent must resist or lose its immunities for ever.*

It might be supposed that the monks would be unanimous in their zeal for the rights of their house, and that the visitation by the bishop would meet with universal resistance. But it was far otherwise; many of the more timid, or the more prudent, saw great difficulties in the matter; they feared the expense of a lawsuit, and trembled in anticipation of great privations which they might have to endure if they ventured to resist the episcopal claim. The elders attributed the usual motives to the younger, who, they thought, desired litigation that they might have an excuse for going abroad, where they would be well fed at the expense of the abbey, while those who remained at home perished of want. Some even withdrew

* Thomas of Marlborough is the writer of the history from which we are quoting, and the author of the greater and most interesting portion of this chronicle of the abbey. Mr. Macray has adopted a superstition too common among his fellow-editors, who think they discover original autographs, and would like to believe that he has the MS. which Thomas wrote himself. Mr. Macray's argument would prove that Thomas was not only a skilful scribe, but also a good mason, carpenter, tailor, goldsmith, and glass-stainer, as well as glass manufacturer. He may have been all this, but it is improbable. It might as well be contended that a voluminous marriage settlement, on several skins of parchment, is in the handwriting of the attorney who presents it for the signature of the parties concerned, as that the MS. which Mr. Macray contemplates is in the handwriting of Thomas of Marlborough. If the term "*fecit*" implies that Thomas wrote it, it must also imply that Thomas was a tailor, for he made two albs: *fecit duas albas. Turres presbyterii fecit; fecit thronum feretii, fecit sedes, fecit fenestram vitream de historia S. Egmuni* (p. 269). Besides all this, he repaired walls and books, and was a perfect mechanic as well as a scientific architect.

from all share in the struggle, though they were prepared to profit by the issue, if it should be favourable to the menaced community. The younger monks, however, prevailed, and it was finally resolved that the bishop should not be permitted to set foot within the monastery, relying on its exemption from his rule.

The abbot, seeing the resolution of the monks, consented to the plan of resistance, and three of them were sent at once to the bishop to inform him of their purpose. The bishop, persisting in his intention, replied that he should visit the abbey. Roger, now dreading the issue, and caring more for himself than for the abbey he so unworthily governed, offered to receive the bishop, and to submit to him in all matters, provided only he himself should be untouched. He had succeeded in this way with a former bishop who visited the abbey, and observing the compact, had never censured the abbot further than to accept from him a promise never to use the pontifical ornaments which had been conceded to the abbot of Evesham.* Malgerus would make no compromise with the abbot, and on the 23rd of August, 1202, early in the morning, arrived at the gates of the abbey.

But at a still earlier hour every preparation had been made within. The monks had said their office before the usual time, and had closed every door and gate by which the abbey could be entered: only the church was open. The bishop's men and horses were not allowed any shelter, for even the stables were closed. The bishop submitted to the indignity, and entered the church, where, after making his prayer, he proceeded to enter upon his duties. His apparitor summoned the abbot and the monks into his presence, but to no purpose; the abbot had taken to flight about sunrise, and was far on his way to, if he had not already reached, one of his country houses.

At the summons of the bishop twelve monks, however, appeared before him, of whom Thomas of Marlborough was one. Thomas, as the lawyer of the house, spoke for his brethren, thanked the bishop for his good intentions, and civilly declined his jurisdiction. While he was still speaking, the whole community entered the church to say tierce; and Thomas, now triumphant, said to the bishop, "Go away; make haste; the monks are coming in for the service of God."

* Mr. Macray, *Index, voc. Adam*, says that "Evesham appears to have been the first abbey that obtained the use of the mitre for its abbot. The grant is dated 1163." The abbot of S. Augustine, Canterbury, had this privilege a hundred years before the abbot of Evesham, Alexander II. having granted it in 1063. *Thorn. ap. Twysden*, col. 1785; and *Historia Monaster. S. Augustini*, ed. Hardwick, p. 27.

"Is this a threat?" asked the bishop. "Certainly," replied Thomas, "for you have come on a foolish errand." The bishop retired, and found his way into the chapter-house, where he summoned the monks once more; and each time the summons was repeated, the same obstinate twelve made their appearance, and formally appealed to the Holy See.

The bishop, thus thwarted, suspended the monks, and prohibited the further celebration of the divine office in the church. Having done this, he took his departure without giving his blessing to the monks, or, indeed, being asked for it. The suspension was regarded as a nullity, because of the appeal, and accordingly the office was sung, and mass was said with greater solemnity, if that were possible, than the abbey had ever witnessed before. This was not all; there were two monks of Worcester in the abbey at the time, where they were entertained, because their own monastery had been lately burnt. Now these two monks were subjects of the bishop, and so the monks of Evesham sent them to their superior the same day, on the ground that he had suspended them that morning, though he had not the remotest intention of doing so.

The next day, the feast of S. Bartholomew, the abbot of Alcester, with divers clerks, came to the abbey—the monks were prepared for the visit—but was refused admittance; and so, standing at the gates of the cemetery—the church he could not enter because of the interdict—pronounced sentence of excommunication, by order of the bishop, against the refractory monks. Notwithstanding this further act of rigour, mass and office were never intermitted in the abbey church.

Thomas was now sent by the monks to inform the abbot, who knew as well as they did what had taken place in the abbey he had cowardly deserted. When the resolute monk reached the hiding-place of "the hireling," he was told that he could not speak to him because he was excommunicated. Thomas, nothing daunted, and probably expecting such treatment, retired to a house belonging to the abbey, where he remained for the night, intending to visit his superior the next day: he had not been importunate because he thought that the abbot might have been drunk. The next morning he fared no better; so he made his way, as he had been directed, to Canterbury; but meeting the archbishop three miles beyond London, he was spared the rest of the journey. He told his story to the primate *cum fletu et ejulatu magno*, and implored his protection against the encroachments of his suffragan, who not only violated the immunities of the abbey, but trenchon on the rights of the metropolitan. The archbishop, after swearing by the blessed Julian, requested Thomas to keep his grievances

to himself for the present, and not to make them known to everybody; for he, the archbishop, would not yield in this matter any of the prerogatives of his see. Thomas attended the primate in church, sat by him at table, and when "I had eaten with him," he says, "I was comforted." And well he might be, for it was a sign that the archbishop made no account of the sentence of excommunication pronounced by the bishop.

The archbishop went down to Worcester in September—the occasion of his visit was that he was one of the commission to inquire into the miracles of S. Wolstan—but gave no decision, and adjourned the further hearing to another day, when he should hold his court at Lincoln. The monks were in great joy, for at least the bishop's sentence was of doubtful value even in the primate's eyes; but there was no rest for Thomas. On his return from Worcester, he was again sent after the abbot, who, despairing of corrupting the bishop, had now taken to flight in earnest, and was on his way to Rome disguised as a layman. Thomas found him at Newbury; and after much persuasion, and by impressing upon him the fact that the archbishop had not treated the monks as excommunicate, prevailed upon him to return. Thomas further promised the miserable abbot that, even if the bishop succeeded in the suit, the monks would not desert him, nor ask the bishop to depose him, provided he stood by his brethren in their great fight for the immunities of the abbey. This promise was most religiously kept by the whole community.

Mr. Macray, in his preface, censures the monks for thus consenting "to tolerate vice in a house dedicated to piety," in order to enable them to escape from the yoke of the diocesan jurisdiction. If Mr. Macray will give the reins to his imagination, and picture to himself a college in Oxford, the head of which shall be not even the choice of that college, but imposed upon it from without, a man of extravagant habits, inobservant of the moral law, frequently non-resident, and, when at his lodgings, heedless of the chapel bell; let him add to this that he treats his Fellows with contumelious scorn, never asks them to dinner, and stints their commons in the common hall—if, under these circumstances, the chancellor of the university or the bishop of a diocese were to propose to visit that college, and promise redress of all grievances, we should like to ask Mr. Macray whether he would think it a wise or unwise proceeding on the part of the aggrieved Fellows if they resisted the encroachments of the chancellor or bishop, who has no jurisdiction within the precincts of the college, and invoked, in preference, the authority of the proper visitor. Mr. Macray,

we are persuaded, would think it wrong in the Fellows to sacrifice the independence of their college and, for the sake of escaping from a present evil, which it is true pressed them sore, to accept an unlawful remedy. The monks of Evesham did the same thing; they declined the unlawful visitation of the bishop of Worcester, and appealed from him—when he attempted to do what he ought not to have attempted—to their own visitor, who was no other than the Sovereign Pontiff himself.

The cause of the abbey was pleaded again at Lincoln, and afterwards in London, but the archbishop gave no sentence; and, indeed, if he had it would have been of no value, because at this time the matter had been practically carried to a higher court. Thomas of Marlborough, foreseeing troubles for the abbey, had procured from Rome a special commission for the settlement of those questions which might arise between the bishop and the abbey. The papal delegates were the abbots of Malmesbury, Abingdon, and Ensham; and to these the archbishop remitted the dispute, because it now belonged to them, and not at all to himself. Before these judges the bishop of Worcester and Thomas appeared; but the bishop at last appealed from them, on the ground that he suspected them of partiality. He went at once to Rome to prosecute his appeal in person, and the abbot and the monks sent also their agents; for, notwithstanding the reconciliation, neither trusted the other. The delegates, however, retained the cause notwithstanding the appeal; and, for greater security, the monks continued to attend their court, for fear they might lose anything by negligence.

The abbot, now secure in his place—for he knew that while this important lawsuit about the rights of the monastery lasted no attack would be made upon him,—began to resume his former courses, and the poor monks were reduced to poverty once more. The farms which should have supplied them with food and raiment were let, without their consent, to tenants who paid their rents to the abbot, and not to the officers of the convent, to whom they ought to have been paid. In this difficulty the monks took the law into their own hands—for nobody had compassion on them—and reaped a field which they had not sown, but the freehold of which was undoubtedly theirs. For this they were summoned before the archbishop and the king, whose anger they had incurred by so summary a process. Thomas of Marlborough was sent, on the part of the convent—he had been probably the instigator of the illegal reaping—to propitiate the archbishop and king John. John refused to listen to him, and sent him away with threats and

revilings. Before the primate he was more successful, and was allowed to plead his cause. He maintained that, as the soil belonged to his convent, so also did all that grew on it, because it could not be alienated without the consent of the owners, and that consent had never been given. He added that the monks would be driven to much worse acts if their grievances were not redressed; and he then called upon the primate to exercise his undoubted powers as protector of the abbey, and to stand between them and ruin. The archbishop again swore by S. Julian that he would see justice done, but he did not live long enough to accomplish his good intentions.

Thomas now left the archbishop, and went to Worcester to plead in the matter of that reaping, as defendant in the action brought against the monks by their own abbot and the steward of the abbey, whose corn had been so feloniously cut. Roger, the abbot, now excommunicated Thomas, and set a watch at the gates of Worcester, with directions to seize him and to throw him into prison. Thomas, however, contrived to enter the city, and in due course appeared in court; but the abbot and the steward objected to his being heard, on the ground of the excommunication. The judges admitted the objection, and Roger had him apprehended; but on the way to prison three friends of the poor monk—chaplains of the archbishop, who came that day to Worcester—rescued him out of the hands of his enemies, and took him to the primate. Two chaplains of the abbot now came to the archbishop, and offering him a silver cup and a palfrey, by way of bribe, demanded the custody of Thomas. The archbishop very prudently requested the abbot to keep the presents till he should send for them, but refused at the same time to deliver up the monk, who, on his part, protesting that he had appealed before the sentence was delivered, insisted upon treating it as a nullity. The primate was thus cautious in the matter of the presents because he did not wish to excite the fears of the abbot, and drive him to appeal against his authority before he had pronounced his sentence in the cause between him and the abbey.

Thomas was allowed to return to Evesham, but not without some misgivings, for the archbishop, who does not seem to have had perfect confidence in him, told him, that if he failed to prove his case, his punishment would be heavier than that of the abbot, even should the abbot be found guilty. Thomas returned to the abbey, but all his brethren were not over glad to receive him; for some of them were angry with him because he had told the primate of the excesses of the house. It is probable, therefore, that Roger had friends and accomplices among the monks whom he treated so ill.

The archbishop now proceeded to Evesham, and, having assembled the whole community in the chapter-house, reproved the monks generally for their disorderly lives, and inquired into the matters in dispute. It was not easy for him to arrive at the truth, for the monks said one thing and the abbot another. At last he offered them either to pronounce his decision himself, or to refer the matter to three arbitrators, of whom he was to be one; while the abbot was to have the choice of another, and the monks that of the third. In fear lest the abbot should appeal from the primate before he gave his sentence, Thomas persuaded the monks to adopt the latter of the two alternatives; and as the abbot also consented, because every delay was in his favour, the arbitrators were chosen. Roger elected Clement, abbot of Chertsey, and the monks Eustace, bishop of Ely. The consent of both parties was recorded in a deed, sealed with the convent seal, and guaranteed by the oaths of those concerned. The award of the arbitrators was, on the whole, in favour of the monks, and against the abbot; nevertheless, four of them were sent away—probably to other houses belonging to the abbey, on account of the transgression they had committed in reaping the field they had not sown. While this internal dispute about the letting of this field distracted the monks, they never forgot the great question between them and the bishop of Worcester; and Thomas relates with satisfaction, that the archbishop and other great men regarded them with admiration for their courage; saying of them, they had never seen such monks.* Thomas of Marlborough himself was one of the banished monks; but, as he was the lawyer of the convent, the archbishop permitted him to return after a fortnight's exile. The abbot would probably have preferred a longer, if not a perpetual banishment, because he was afraid that the monks might proceed against him before the arbitrators, and obtain his deposition. The monks had bound themselves not to accuse him before the bishop, but they were at liberty to do so before the primate and the Pope; and, by his own consent, before the arbitrators, though he probably was not aware how much he had yielded when he assented to their appointment. He was now in great fear, and so made his preparations for travelling to Rome, because his appeal to the Pope, even if he failed, would at least delay the expected deprivation.

But by this time the bishop of Worcester had returned from Rome, bringing with him, with the consent of the proctors

* "*Archiepiscopus et alii terræ magnates admirati sunt, dicentes, quod nunquam tales monachos viderant*" (p. 130).

for the abbey, a commission from the Sovereign Pontiff, directed to the bishop and the prior of Coventry, and to the archdeacon of Northampton. These three were to hear the cause of the abbey and the bishop, but under certain restrictions. They were to ascertain who, in point of fact, possessed the contested jurisdiction at the beginning of the dispute; and, if the bishop proved his claim, they were to give him possession of the jurisdiction: otherwise not. But on the real merits of the case—to which of the two parties, the bishop or the abbey, the jurisdiction rightfully belonged—they were not to give any sentence whatever, but to transmit all evidences and documents to Rome, where the Pope himself would give his decision. This was nothing but the ordinary practice; for, seeing that the bishop alleged that he had been disturbed by the monks in the possession of a right, he could not be required to plead before he was restored to the position he occupied before the commencement of the suit. The duty of the delegates was twofold; to give sentence upon the fact of possession, and to receive evidence as to the right. The proctors of the bishop seem to have neglected this distinction, for they argued the whole question before the delegates, and did not keep their evidences distinct. They saw the mistake they had made only when it became necessary for them to furnish their adversaries with copies of their proofs, called, technically, publication. Thomas of Marlborough knew from the beginning that they were blundering; but, as it was not his duty to help the bishop, he held his peace. When the error was discovered, the bishop's proctors requested the delegates to suppress all that portion of their proofs which related to the question of right; but the monks refused to consent, and insisted upon having copies of the whole, because it was impossible now to keep anything back from their knowledge without manifest wrong to them and their monastery.

The delegates, finding it impossible to separate the evidence into two parts, decreed publication of the whole. Thomas and his friends saw at once that their case was hopeless—Thomas knew it from the very beginning—and that the bishop must recover possession. The rights of the abbey had been so carelessly maintained, and the interference of the bishops of Worcester so frequent, that it could not be doubted that the bishop was actually seized of the jurisdiction when the monks refused to admit him into the abbey, and treated the sentence of excommunication with contempt. In fact, the monks knew that in the matter of possession their case was bad; the bishop was really seized of the jurisdiction he claimed; but they were confident that when the question of right came to be argued in Rome the victory would be theirs.

Under these circumstances there was but one course open to them; they must take the cause to Rome as soon as they could. Roger Norreys himself was of the same mind, though he may not have been influenced by the reasons that prevailed with the monks. The bishop also, taking advantage of the sentence of the delegates,* did what he could to induce the reluctant community to accept it; he treated them with all kindness, and as many of them as he could he invited to dine with him at Fledbury. The politeness of the bishop bore fruit; some of the brethren thought it would be as well for them to be subject to him. Thomas, however, was not to be persuaded; and, in the monastery he impressed upon his brethren the inconveniences of the episcopal rule, and the consequent ruin of the abbey. The more prudent listened to him, and the result was that an immediate recourse was had to Rome. The advice of the more timid brethren was rejected, and the abbey prepared for a determined prosecution of its suit.

Roger Norreys also found it necessary to go to Rome: he feared the bishop, and, above all, his own monks. Besides, he was hampered by his own consent to an arbitration, and was not certain that his deposition might not be the result of any complaints made against him before the arbitrators. This latter fear was well-grounded, for the monks earnestly desired to lay all their complaints before this tribunal, though they would make no accusation against him before the bishop. They were precluded from this by the promise made at Newbury, and by their own refusal to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the bishop. Roger therefore prepared for his journey, and the monks with some difficulty obtained his consent to the appointment of Thomas as proctor for the abbey. Roger, though he assented, would not travel with Thomas; but as it was dangerous to let him go by himself, he made one of his chaplains accompany him, so that he might have some knowledge of his proceedings on the road. These three met together to arrange their affairs before quitting England, and made a solemn promise, confirmed by oath, that they would be true and faithful

* Mr. Macray (p. 131, and Preface p. xlv.) says that the sentence was pronounced April 24, 1205, and (in p. 147) that Thomas left Rome April 18 of the same year; but the sentence had been then reported to the Pope by the bishop: *jam significaverat episcopus Domino Papæ quod pro eo lata fuit sententia in iudicio possessorio* (p. 146). The facts seem to be that the sentence was pronounced perhaps before Michaelmas term 1204, but not executed till April 24, 1205. The text is express: *missus est episcopus in plenam possessionem jurisdictionis . . . Dominica quæ cantatur Misericordia Domini* (p. 131), that is, April 24; but it does not say that the sentence was pronounced on that day: it was pronounced some time before, because it was known in Rome even before that day. In a second edition Mr. Macray must alter his marginal notes.

to one another. Thomas says he kept his oath; but the others were of more elastic consciences, and so conducted themselves as to authorize him to charge them with a breach of their oath whenever it proved to be convenient for them to do so.

Thomas with many tears took leave of his brethren, but resolved never to return if he lost his cause. In the event of failure, he made up his mind to spend the rest of his days in a religious house in Rome, because he could never bear to see the abbey he loved shorn of rights which he believed belonged to it. Having received the benediction of his superiors, he left the house with the abbot's chaplain and two servants. They had two horses to carry them, and Thomas showed himself merciful even to his beast, for he used it so well that it carried him to Rome. The abbot's clerk had not been so careful, for he had changed his horse three times. On the fortieth day after leaving Evesham, the travellers entered the Holy City, and Thomas proceeded at once to implore the Pope, Innocent III., to suspend the execution of the sentence pronounced by the delegates, and to determine the whole question himself. The Pope assented to the monk's request, and Thomas in the joy of his heart offered the Pontiff a silver cup of the value of six marks. But the matter was not so easy as he thought, for when he petitioned the Pope to issue the necessary letters for the revocation of the suit to Rome, he found his Holiness not so ready to comply as he expected. It is likely enough that the Pope had doubts about the facts; however that may be, the answer that Thomas got was, "We have heard that your abbot is detained on the road; find out by whom and where, and we will procure his release; when that is done you shall have your letters." Thomas pressed his suit—insisted upon the fact that the bishop's letters were informal, and that the revocation of the cause was due of right. The Pope replied that he had granted the commission with a full knowledge of the facts, and that he would not now recall it. "That is my answer," said the Pope. "Truly," said Thomas, "but it is an act of power." The Pope was patient, and asked him if the answer was not also according to law. Thomas was now insolent, and replied, "I do not know." Upon this the Pope ordered him to hold his peace and withdraw from his presence.

This was at the end of the year 1204, and in January of the following year Thomas and his companion went to Piacenza in quest of their missing abbot: there they heard that he had been imprisoned at Chalons. He was released after a time, and Thomas next heard of him in Lombardy. As it was of some consequence to find him, Thomas and his companion separated in order to prosecute the search, but with an understanding that

whichever of them should first fall in with the abbot should send news of his good fortune to the other. Faith was not kept with Thomas, and the abbot and his chaplain entered Rome, in the first week of Lent, together, without giving him any information. Thomas of Marlborough discovered the fraud, and, on the fifth day after the abbot's entrance, entered also, but in disguise, for he was in some fear of his superior. Some of the abbot's retainers, lounging at the gates of the city, recognized him even in his disguise; but he was not disconcerted, because he had anticipated the British invention of *habeas corpus*, and had given a lawyer in Rome a certain sum of money to procure his release should the dreaded Roger make him a prisoner in his lodgings. Provided against all violence in this way, he now entered the abbot's dwelling, and found him in bed. Thomas addressed him, but received no answer—even to his tender inquiries after his health, and was at last requested by the abbot's servants to withdraw. The next day, attended by his lawyer and others as witnesses, he went again to the abbot's lodgings. He entered alone, leaving his friends in the street, but with instructions to demand him if he did not reappear at the proper time. Thomas saluted the abbot, but was not saluted in return; nevertheless, he persisted in his civilities, and even asked the abbot to lodge him in his house. Roger was very angry, and called him a traitor; but it ended as Thomas desired. For a fortnight the abbot never spoke to him, and on the first day sent him an order never to leave the house, and never to enter the court but in his company. All this time Roger assumed to be a most exemplary monk, solicited powers to correct the excesses of his subjects, and, in particular, to expel two disturbers of his convent's peace, a physician and a lawyer—none others than Thomas of Northwich and Thomas of Marlborough himself, though their names were not mentioned in the brief.

The pleasure of living in the same house with the abbot could not have been very great, but it was useful to Thomas in many ways, for he thereby kept a watch upon the movements of Roger, and did his duty to the abbey he loved so well. Thomas cared nothing for the abbot, it being the firm resolution of himself and his brethren to obtain his expulsion as soon as the lawsuit about the exemption should have been decided against the bishop of Worcester. One of the abbot's chaplains, Henry Coleham, warned Thomas of the danger he incurred, for that Roger had serious designs upon his liberty, if not upon his life. Thomas prepared himself for the event by intrusting what money he had about him to his friend, and furnishing himself with a knife, which he carried about his person, resolved,

apparently, to use it, we are sorry to say, whenever the occasion should arise. Judges and magistrates in these days make many severe remarks upon the un-English usage of the knife, which has become too common in modern times; but there is no period of our history in which that weapon has not been employed. Thomas of Marlborough, though a learned lawyer and a monk, seems to have had no misgivings about it when he thought he could use it to his own advantage and in his own defence.

Notwithstanding the unpleasant relations subsisting between the abbot and his monks, there was no diminution of zeal in prosecuting the claims of the abbey. They obtained a confirmation of all the privileges belonging to it, and Roger more than once appeared in the Papal presence wearing his mitre. But they could not obtain any letters to suspend the effect of the sentence of the delegates, and Roger could not procure his release from the obligation of submitting to the arbitrators. The bishop of Worcester had informed the Pope of the sentence given in his favour by the delegates, and the proctors of the abbey could do nothing more till the bishop or his lawyers came to Rome. The abbot and Thomas, therefore, went to make the customary presents, and for this purpose borrowed 400 marks; but the presents could not be received till the members of the court were certified that Roger and Thomas were neither plaintiffs nor defendants in any cause then before it.

They now left Rome—on the 18th April, 1205,—Roger for England, attended by his creditors, who went to receive their money; Thomas for Bologna, where he waited for further instructions about the lawsuit, but heard attentively the lectures of the professors of canon and civil law. Roger, at Vercelli, met Adam Sortes, one of his monks, who was going to Rome to appeal against the sentence of the delegates; and, as he knew that the whole cause would have to be argued, he told the monk to follow him to England. Adam did so, but with great difficulty, for he had to walk nearly the whole way, and yet he reached the abbey before Roger. At Evesham the monks were in trouble; the bishop had taken formal possession of the contested jurisdiction, and, as soon as Roger returned, summoned that unworthy prelate to submit to the visitation. Roger, now clearly in the wrong, shut the gates of the abbey in the face of the bishop, and was excommunicated for his contumacy. But when he saw that the sentence was respected, and that none would venture to hold any communication with him, he withdrew from Evesham, and left the bishop undisturbed in the peaceful exercise of his rights as visitor. Yet for all this, the bishop, though received with all outward reverence, was still comparatively powerless; for when he held his court, and made

inquiries into the life and conversation of the abbot, not one of the monks, though they longed for the deposition of their superior, would give him the slightest information. The bishop warned them, and threatened even to excommunicate them, if they persisted in their silence. Upon this the monks threw their cowls at the feet of the unwelcome visitor, and said they would quit the abbey till the question between him and them should be finally decided. The bishop was touched, for he was a good man—even the monks who resisted him bore willing testimony to his worth and good faith in his dealings with them—and abstained from further proceedings, to the great satisfaction of Roger, who once more escaped from the justice that was dogging his steps; slowly, it is true, but without halting.

Thomas meanwhile was perfecting himself at Bologna in the science of law—*audiens quotidie leges et canones*—in order to the better pleading of his cause. The delegates in England had appointed the octaves of S. Martin for the appearance of the proctors, both of the bishop and of the abbey, before the Pope. Their report was now in Rome, and there Thomas, who had quitted Bologna at Michaelmas, met the bishop's lawyers, the chief of whom was Robert of Clipston. They were come to defend the bishop in the exercise of that jurisdiction which he claimed over the abbey—admitted by the delegates to belong to him—and to recover for him, if possible, the same jurisdiction over the churches of the Vale of Evesham, but which the delegates found to be vested in the monks.

The Papal delegates had decided that the jurisdiction of the abbey was, in point of fact, vested in the bishop; but they decided also that the churches of the Vale were not subject to him. They had no power to decide the question of law. Both parties to the suit lost and gained, but the loss of the monks was the heavier, for they were condemned to make satisfaction to the bishop for their contumacy. The abbey was to lie under an interdict for three days, and the monks were to submit, in the chapter-house, to the discipline which the bishop should inflict upon every one of them. They were to stand barefoot at the abbey gates, and on bended knees to implore his forgiveness when he should come to take possession; and for three weeks after the removal of the interdict, only thirteen of the monks were to be permitted to say mass in the abbey. From this sentence the monks appealed, and for the purpose of meeting that appeal, as well as for the purpose of setting aside the decree which gave the churches of the Vale to the convent, the proctors of the bishop were now in Rome.

When the report of the delegates, together with the sentence, was brought up before the Pope, Thomas, as the proctor of

Evesham, was called upon to plead. Thomas had not been idle at Bologna, and was perfectly instructed as to the truth of the common saying, that possession is nine points of the law: he therefore said that all the evidences of the abbey had not yet reached him, and he was therefore unable to plead the question so far as it related to the churches of the Vale. It was the fixed resolve of Thomas to put off as long as possible all discussion of that part of the sentence which was favourable to the abbey, for he knew that the longer the abbey held that jurisdiction, the more difficult it would be to take it away. On the other hand, he was ready and eager to plead against the bishop in the matter of the jurisdiction over the abbey, and offered at once to enter upon it. To his great astonishment, he found the bishop's proctors willing to gratify his desire. He very honestly tells us that he considered them to have been infatuated, but he does not hesitate to take advantage of their folly, though he wonders that they should risk the cause of their employer, who could gain nothing by such a course, because he was already in possession of the right he claimed, and it was the business of the monks to attack him.

Thomas was, perhaps, not altogether without doubts as to the meaning of this readiness on the part of the bishop's proctor, to put their master's cause in such evident peril. After much seeking and reflection, he learned that they were anxious to quit Rome on account of the sickliness of the season. When he saw that they were more careful of their own health than of the cause intrusted to their faithfulness, he took courage, and despaired his adversaries. Hereupon he advises his brethren never to commit their causes to mercenaries, but only to monks, or to persons associated with monks, who hold the interest of their house, which was to have a perpetual existence, to be of more value than the life of one of its members.

On the day appointed, early in December, 1205, the litigants appeared before the court, presided over by Pope Innocent III. in person. Thomas had retained four of the most eminent lawyers, and his adversary complained to the Pope of this proceeding. His Holiness smiled, and said there was no lack of lawyers in the Roman court. The fees were not heavy, for the highest was but twelve shillings each court day; the second and the third lawyer received nine shillings each, and the fourth was content with four shillings and sixpence. Thomas saw one of his lawyers afterwards as a Spanish bishop sitting in the great Lateran Council, 1215. The pleadings were opened by Robert of Clipston, a man learned in the law, both civil and canon, though he had made the mistake of assuming the responsibility of being plaintiff in a suit where he might have been only

defendant. His eloquence was rather troublesome, for the Pope was wearied by the introductory part of his speech, and told him to address himself to the substance of his case. However, he was not quite master of his words, and could not compress them within reasonable limits. Thomas thinks he was somewhat put out, because he confined himself to the justification of the sentence of the delegates, the confirmation of which he demanded. He said nothing of the merits of the question, viz., as to the right of the bishop to the jurisdiction conceded to him by the delegates, but which may have been, for all that had yet appeared, a mere usurpation on the part of the bishops of Worcester; and it does not seem that the monastery objected to the sentence, so far as the delegates were concerned.

Thomas now rose to reply, and began by asking if it was necessary for him to say anything of the bishop's actual possession, because it was so recent and only for the moment. This was ignoring all the pleadings of Robert. The Pope desired him to speak to the real merits of the case, and discuss the exemption of the monastery from the jurisdiction of the bishop. Thomas then, *flens et ejulans*, renouncing all the arts of the orator in word, but using them in fact—as men are wont to do who protest that they mean to forego such aids—entered on the history of the abbey, produced the bulls, and argued on their meaning, which he maintained exempted the monastery from the visitation of the bishop for ever. He showed that the monks of Evesham were subjects of the Pope, not of the bishop, and that they were protected against the latter by the Apostolic privileges in every possible way and in all possible cases. He ended his speech by a prayer that the Holy See would for the future protect the abbey against the bishop, even if the old privileges were not extensive enough, though he thought they were perfectly clear and sufficient for the purpose. He consented, nevertheless, to obey the bishop, if in anything the bishop had a right to command him. His Holiness was a little amused, and, when Thomas had ended, turned to the cardinals and said: "Well, he takes everything away from the bishop, and then says, let him have what remains!"

Robert of Clipston was now called upon to reply, and his answer was, that the bulls produced were forgeries, and, in particular, that of Pope Constantine, which he said was unknown in England. Thomas was ordered to produce them, which he did, and the Pope examined them minutely in open court. Thomas shook with fear at this, and is unable to repress the terror that then overwhelmed him when he saw the Pope handle the bulls and pull the thread that held the seal.

The examination seems to have been a rigid one: the bulls were handed to the cardinals, who also scrutinized them, and at last they came back into the hands of the Pontiff, who, to the unutterable joy of Thomas, said, "These are genuine; though you may not know them, we know them well: they are not forgeries." The Pope then rose, and assigned them the third day from that for the further hearing of the cause.

On the third day Robert of Clipston argued before the Consistory that the privileges of the abbey had been lost by non-usage, and that the bishops of Worcester had prescription against the monks, who had in many ways submitted to episcopal control. The facts were enumerated, and were admitted by the opposite side; for, simply as facts, they were notorious, and could not be denied. Abbots of Evesham had been careless, and had neglected their rights. When Robert had concluded his proofs, Thomas was called upon to say what he could allege to destroy the value of these acts and in reply to the plea of prescription set up and proved. Thomas admitted that the bishops of Worcester had exercised jurisdiction in and over the abbey; but he maintained that no right could be inferred therefrom, because the monks had always resisted and protested. Some of the acts alleged were without prejudice, because the bishop had been invited to perform them; and the appearance of the abbot in the diocesan synods was explained by the fact that the abbey held some churches which were not exempt from the diocesan rule. The facts of the case having been thus settled and admitted by both sides, the Pope called upon the consistorial lawyers employed by both parties to argue the question of law, the proctors having been obliged to confine themselves to facts. The lawyers occupied two court days in the discussion, at the end of which there remained only one point for further argument, which Thomas settled triumphantly by the help of knowledge furnished him by the great Azo* at Bologna, and for which, according to his account, he had to pay.

The trial was now over, and nothing remained but to wait for the sentence of the Sovereign Pontiff. Thomas shall tell his story in his own words:—

Aware that human means were exhausted, I had recourse to Divine, to the intercession of the saints, almsgiving, prayer, and fasting. This was on a

* "Quas a domino Assone tunc temporis legum dominorum domino Bononiæ non sine pretio didiceram" (p. 168). If this be Azo, whom Baldus called the fountain of law and the vessel of election, the received accounts that he was dead in 1200 must be incorrect; and there must therefore be a mistake in the restored monument to his memory which is copied by Forster, "*Histor. Juris.*"

Thursday, and Christmas-day fell on the following Sunday. I visited the shrines of the saints, and commended to them myself and the cause of my church : to every poor man I met, whether asked or not, I gave alms of the goods of the church of Evesham, persevering in prayer and fasting till after the sentence was delivered on Christmas-eve. Early on Saturday morning I went into court, and as each of the cardinals came in I embraced his feet, revealing by tears rather than by words the affliction of my soul. I entreated them to have compassion on their servants and their church. So earnest was I in my importunities, that not only the cardinals, but my opponents also, and all who saw me, felt compassion for me. I was still persevering in prayer when, about noon, our lord the Pope came out of his room with the cardinals. When he had taken his seat, the proctors of Evesham and Worcester were called. I was comforted when I heard myself first mentioned, though the apparitors of the court had generally called me first because I had been liberal to them, in order to get into court the more readily. We now stood, as we were accustomed to stand, over against one another on two sides of the court ; but the Pope, on seeing us, said, "Stand together in the middle, for there is no dispute now between you : I have made peace." At first I did not understand, but afterwards, when the Holy Ghost was given us by the sentence of our lord the Pope, all this became clear. When we had stood together, the Pope said, "The cause depending between our venerable brother the bishop of Worcester and our beloved children the abbot and monks of Evesham, touching the subjection and exemption of that monastery, we have carefully examined, and, after inspecting and clearly understanding the bulls and evidences produced, have by our written sentence determined : and now, departing from our usual custom, we order our sentence to be read." Then Master Philip, Prothonotary, afterwards bishop of Troja, rose and said :—"To the abbot and brethren of the monastery of Evesham." When I heard these words my spirit revived within me, for I knew the Pope's style, for he always directed the briefs to the successful litigant. When the sentence had been read, all of us went and threw ourselves at the Pope's feet, both plaintiff and defendant, as the custom is, and thanked him ; but when I was stooping down to kiss the feet of our lord the Pope, I fainted away for joy, and through weakness induced by fasting. . . . At the door of the court I met Adam Sortes (a monk of Evesham), bringing certain papers from home. Him I embraced, and took to my lodgings, and as soon as we had tasted food we were comforted, and gave God thanks for all His benefits, for He had dealt with us according to His great mercy, Who liveth and reigneth world without end. Amen.

Thomas, though victorious, was not yet at liberty, for the sentence in his favour relieved him only of half his burden. He had still to appear before the Pope, and this time in defence of the sentence which the delegates in England had given in favour of the abbey. Robert of Clipston impugned the decision, and claimed the churches of the Vale for his client the bishop. Thomas had to bear the whole weight of this lawsuit himself, because his money was spent, and lawyers could not be found

to plead for nothing. He was not disheartened, and asserted that the churches of the Vale were mere chapels of the great church of the abbey, and, as members of it, must be free. Robert denied this, and said that the churches in question had fonts of their own, there being no font in the Abbey Church. Upon this the Pope interrupted the pleaders, and, looking at Thomas, said, "Proctor, speak the truth; is the font with you, or are there fonts in those churches?" Thomas, thus brought up, was obliged to answer, and the answer was, "We have none; the churches have their own fonts." The observation of the Pope was, "Plead something else." Thomas very honestly adds that this plea was of very little use to him; but he reminds his brethren that if they had had a font for forty years in the abbey, while the churches of the Vale had none, he would have gained his cause. Having been thus foiled in what he regarded as a good argument, he then proceeded to show that the whole territory of the Vale was included in the charters of the monastery, and was really part of it; but, as this was a matter of fact requiring other proofs than the assertion of Thomas, the Pope adjourned the hearing to another day. When the court sat again, the discussion turned upon the sentence of the delegates, and Thomas tried to show that it might be accepted as conclusive; the churches he mentioned were free of episcopal control by prescription and immemorial usage. Here the Pope asked Robert of Clipston whether the monks had really prescription in their favour. Robert admitted the fact, but denied that any prescription could deprive the bishop of his right. "Holy Father," said he, "we have learned in the schools, and it is the opinion of our doctors, that no prescription can prevail against the episcopal rights." The Pope replied, "Well, you and your doctors must have drunk a good deal of beer when you were learning this."* Thomas then argued against this drunken opinion; and at last the Pope, somewhat offended with Robert, who was, it must be admitted, not very earnest in the defence of the bishop, said: "We have heard that the church of Worcester has been vacant more frequently than any other in England, and it may be that, taking vacancies into account, the abbey has not really gained the jurisdiction it claims by prescription." Thomas confesses that the Pope said this as a just judge; but nevertheless he was unable to refrain himself, and said, "Holy Father, yours is the

* "Pater Sancte, nos didicimus in scholis, et hæc est opinio magistrorum nostrorum, quod non currit prescriptio contra jura episcopalia.' Et Dominus Papa, 'Certe et tu et magistri tui multum bibistis de cerevisiâ Anglicanâ quando hæc didicistis' " (p. 189).

fulness of power, and all things are therefore lawful for you; yet, according to the law, no other judge may help an advocate in matters of fact, but only in matters of law." To this the Pope replied, "You are in error; a judge may help in both." Thomas held his tongue, though he had a grievance, and actually complains that the sentence was delayed through the justice of the Pope. The result was a new commission, and the fact of prescription was to be tried over again in England by the bishops of Ely and Rochester, with Benedict, one of the canons of St. Paul's, London.

It is commonly said that the Popes always favoured the monks whenever they attempted to release themselves from the control of the bishops; and some have gone so far as to say, that money rather than justice, or even expediency, was the moving cause of the many immunities which were enjoyed by religious houses. But in this story of Evesham Abbey there is no trace of anything of the kind; the monks were too much impoverished to pay anybody, and their abbot was, if not hostile, certainly lukewarm in their cause. Thomas of Marlborough, though he gained his suit, admits that the Pope was not favourable to him, or to his views, and says plainly that the bishop had the good wishes of the Sovereign Pontiff, who apparently did not, in the least degree, desire to see the churches of the Vale of Evesham exempt from episcopal control and subject only to the abbey. If the churches of the Vale were exempted originally by a Papal act, that was the work of the bishop of Worcester, who founded the abbey, and who voluntarily resigned whatever rights he had, or his successors might have. If, on the other hand, the abbey obtained the jurisdiction over those churches by prescription, that was the fault of the bishops of Worcester from time to time, and the Pope could give sentence only on the facts proved before him. The bishop asked for his rights, the abbey asked for its rights also, and there was no other means of settling the dispute than that of evidence of possession.

On the 18th January, 1206, was signed and sealed the great sentence by which the abbey recovered its rights, and by which the bishop of Worcester lost the visitation of the monastery for ever. Thomas tried to get it in duplicate, but he failed. He succeeded, however, in procuring its insertion at full length in the executory letters, and this, under the circumstances, was no little advantage, and, indeed, sufficient for his purpose, because he was not likely to get permission to leave Rome himself. The abbot and he had borrowed 400 marks, and the lenders, who had gone to England with the abbot in order to be paid, had returned without their money. They were, therefore, in

no humour to lend more, and were even lying in wait for Thomas, who had himself borrowed fifty marks, that they might put him in prison. More than this, the Pope himself, probably on the application of the creditors, had forbidden Thomas to quit the city. Thomas was not without help; he and the abbot's clerk, and Adam Sortes, were bent on returning; and, as Adam was seriously ill, he was sent secretly away with the executory letters, and Thomas now could contemplate his creditors without very painful emotions. Adam travelled as fast as he could, and presented the letters to the abbot of Westminster and Stanlegh, who were to put them in force; and, on the second Sunday after Easter, which was the ecclesiastical anniversary of the day on which the bishop had entered the abbey the year before, the monks were again free.

Thomas remained in Rome at the mercy of his creditors, to whom he was forced to consign the original sentence by way of pledge for the debt; but he cared little for this now, because it had gone secretly to Evesham in a sufficiently authentic form. The chaplain of the abbot also was still in Rome, and on his falling ill, Thomas sent him home with the Roman creditors, who were to go to Evesham with all the papers, and to deliver them up on payment of their debt. Thomas was detained by the Pope, for reasons not told us, but sorely against his will. According to his own account, it was because he had not made the usual presents to the judges of his cause. Be this as it may, Thomas was not a man to be easily beaten. He visited the shrines of the Apostles, and of the saints of the holy city, and then, mingling in a crowd which was kneeling to receive the Papal benediction, considered himself as blessed, and withdrew secretly from Rome. He expected to be pursued and caught, but he was not—perhaps his absence was never observed—and at last he arrived in England, bent upon accomplishing the deposition of the abbot.

Roger, having escaped out of the hands of the bishop, and looking upon his position as unassailable in any court except that of the Pope himself, began to make the monastery a more comfortable place to govern upon his peculiar principles. He proposed to expel those two disturbers of the peace, Thomas of Marlborough and Thomas of Northwich; but the monks resisted, and made common cause with the intended victims of the abbot's malice. The aged and infirm monks were to remain in the monastery, guardians of the relics and the treasure of the church; the common seal was hid in the ground, and the old men were to offer a passive resistance to the abbot, even to the effusion of their blood. On S. Catherine's day, November 25th, 1206, thirty-two monks left the convent in procession,

with the cross borne before them. The abbot was sitting in his court, administering justice, but he saw that strange procession, and knew at once what it meant. He summoned his friends and retainers to the pursuit, and with swords and staves hurried after the departing Israelites, who were running away from the tyranny of Pharaoh. Having overtaken them, he bade them return. The habit of obedience was strong, and one of them moved towards the abbot, but was instantly restrained by one of his brethren, who denounced his weakness. Authority now proved powerless, and the monks refused to obey. The abbot directed his men to use material force: against the drawn swords of his retainers, the monks used their staves, and there ensued a serious fight on the road, unarmed priests contending against the mailed soldiers of the abbot. With their wooden staves the monks drove back the abbot's men, and then pursued their journey, giving God thanks that they had lost none of their number, though their enemies had suffered severely.

The abbot did not think it could do him any service to lose his monks in this way, so, collecting his scattered troopers he, followed them again, and now, in a more peaceable manner, endeavoured to move them from their resolution. They consented at last to return upon certain terms—one of which was the surrender of the brief in virtue of which he had expelled the two monks. The brief was delivered up, and instantly torn to pieces. The seal of the monastery was then sent for from its hiding-place, and peace was sealed and sworn to between the abbot and his monks, who in the evening were once more safe at Evesham, but not more reconciled to Roger than was Roger to them.

Meanwhile the bishop of Worcester was prosecuting his claim to the jurisdiction over the churches of the Vale before the Papal commissioners, to whom the Pope had delegated the power to decide the question, provided the litigants would be bound by their decree. After several hearings before the judges, the bishop and the abbot agreed upon a compromise; but the monks refused to be a party to it, and the litigation continued, because it was clearly not to the interest of the abbey to have it brought to an end. In the year 1208 the commission was suspended, because of the interdict of the kingdom brought upon it by the wickedness of king John; nor could it be resumed before the submission of that sovereign to the Pontiff he had outraged. The bishop, Malgerus, was forced to quit the kingdom, and died in July, 1212, at Pontigny, where he had taken refuge from the persecution of the king.

The Roman creditors were in England when John set the

law at defiance and refused to allow Cardinal Langton to take possession of the archbishopric of Canterbury. His wrath fell also upon these innocent men, whom he compelled to give up their securities to his safe-keeping. The papers were kept in the treasury in London, but were afterwards removed to Corfe Castle, and in these removals one of them was lost or stolen. When they recovered them from the king's officers, they brought their action against the monastery of Evesham and claimed the principal of 400 marks, together with 700 more on the ground of expenses and by way of penalty for the delayed payment. Thomas of Marlborough appeared for the abbey, as usual, and pleaded that nothing was due by way of penalty because the king had seized the lands of Evesham, and had made it impossible for the monks to satisfy any of their creditors. The matter after much discussion was compromised, and the creditors consented to accept 500 marks in satisfaction of the whole debt.

Roger Norreys refused to ratify this agreement, and swore that he would never pay it. Thomas remarks ironically upon this—that he must have had the spirit of prophecy when he took that oath. The legate Nicholas, bishop of Frascati, was now in England, and in November, 1213, went down to Evesham to investigate the story of that unhappy monastery, and to administer to it the justice it had need of. Now, at last, the time had come when the long-forbearing monks could tell their grievances and demand justice in the presence of one whose jurisdiction they all acknowledged. No rights of the abbey could be compromised now, and no alien could enter in. They had been patient and silent for more than twenty years; they had suffered hunger and thirst; they had been scantily clad in winter, and they had been rendered unable to keep their rule; they had been more than once offered relief, but, as its acceptance involved the loss of rights and the encroachments of usurped jurisdiction, they generously forbore, and endured affliction, waiting for the true Moses, who was to deliver them out of the hands of the oppressor. The Papal legate was a lawful judge.

The legate, surrounded by his clerks, and with many abbots in his train, sat down in the chapter-house of Evesham, and bade Thomas open pleadings against Roger, the unworthy abbot. Thomas at first was silent, but at last he spoke, and to some purpose. He gave a biography of the abbot in the abbot's hearing. He described the ruin of the monastery, temporal and spiritual, the neglect of the divine office, the dilapidations of the property, the intrusion of the abbot, and his tyrannical rule. When the terrible story had been all told, the abbot was called upon for his answer. Roger could not deny the

facts, but he objected to the admission of the witnesses, because they were his monks, and banded together in a conspiracy to procure his deposition. The legate overruled the objection, and Roger had no other defence; for, the witnesses once admitted, his case was gone. Even now the legate showed mercy in his justice: he asked Roger to resign,—it was the only way to save his reputation. Roger at first refused; but after a little reflection he consented, and the legate cut the knot that bound him to the abbey. But as the man had been a monk, though a scandalous one, and had filled so conspicuous a place as that of abbot of Evesham, the legate would not humble him more than he could help. The prior of Penwortham, in Lancashire—no other than Adam Sortes, who had taken refuge there,—wished to return to the abbey from which the harshness of Roger had driven him; and, accordingly, the legate replaced him by the fallen abbot. Roger seems to have been hopelessly incurable; even now he did not repent, and the legate, at the end of five months, was compelled to remove him. Roger now went to Rome, but he obtained no help there; on his return, he offered his wretched services to the bishop of Worcester, and whatever ill he could do to the abbey that he did; but his strength was not equal to his will. He was now a monk loose on the world, as he was when Baldwin and Richard sent him, to their great discredit, to be abbot of Evesham. At last another legate, Pandulf, had pity on him and sent him back to Penwortham, where he lived nearly six years. During that interval, with death drawing nearer day by day, he refused to be reconciled to the monks of Evesham. They were anxious about his soul, and entreated him to be at peace with them; but he would not listen, and the miserable man, so far as the monks knew, died in his uncharitable spirit, hating the monks whose very bread he was eating, and to which he had no right; for he had never been one of the monks of the abbey which he had so scandalously outraged by his wicked life and graceless demeanour.

The litigation about the churches of the Vale rested now with the bishops of Worcester, for the abbey was content with the sentence of the delegates. Thomas had discovered and denounced in Rome an act of the bishops which was not likely to help them. It seems that when secular priests had been deans of the Valley they had paid to the bishops of Worcester the sum of one pound, which was due for Peter's pence,* and

* It may interest some to learn that the tax of Peter's pence was a fixed sum, levied on each diocese separately, without reference to the number of houses or of persons. The largest sum, £42, was levied on Lincoln; and the smallest, £5, was raised in the diocese of Ely.

that the bishops had not accounted for that sumⁿ to the Papal treasury,—“*defraudantes Ecclesiam Romanam*” (p. 199).

After defending the abbey for so many years, it became the duty of Thomas one day to accept the dignity of abbot, to which he was raised by the unanimous voice of his brethren. During his rule the lawsuit lingered, and he was not disposed to move in it. He had gone to his eternal rest before the bishops of Worcester finally retired from the contest, and the jurisdiction of the Valley was vested, beyond dispute, in the monks, after a struggle of nearly half a century. At the dissolution of the abbeys, the contested jurisdiction was still held by the monastery; and even then it was not given to the bishop, nor, at a later time, to the protestants who entered in upon the possessions of the church. That jurisdiction was given away—if given away it was—to Christ Church, Oxford, together with the churches of the Vale: “For six hundred years the diocesan remained deprived of his jurisdiction,” says Mr. Macray (p. xxvii., note), but on what principle passes our understanding. The diocesan never had a church in the Valley that owned his rule; for when S. Egwyn obtained the land, it was a barren and waste place; the bishop’s jurisdiction was, by S. Egwyn’s own act, excluded before a stone of the abbey was laid, or a single church raised in that desolate country. Mr. Macray is also, in our opinion, very unfair in his appreciation of the monks, whom he blames for seeking the deposition of Roger Norreys for his “injustice and harshness to themselves” rather than for his “notorious immorality.” They were certainly not anxious to reveal the turpitudes even of Roger, who had but small claim on their forbearance, because he was not one of them, but had been thrust upon them by the power of the king and the archbishop; and surely this is to their credit. They spared the abbot, who never spared them; held their tongues from detraction; and were satisfied, in the pursuit of justice, to obtain it with as little scandal as possible, and in a way that would leave Roger the amplest means of mending his life without making public the great sins that stained it. The monks saw things in the light of charity as well as in that of justice, and we do not think that Mr. Macray perfectly appreciates their position.

ART. III.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The Greek Testament. By HENRY ALFORD, D.D. London :
Strahan & Co. 1859.

THE controversy about the authorship and writership of the Epistle to the Hebrews comes down from ancient times, and it may fairly be called a vexed question if ever there was one. Various opinions obtained in different portions of the early Church, and after being laid to rest for a thousand years they have been resuscitated and still further multiplied by Protestant criticism from Luther downwards. Germany, as might be expected, takes a leading part in the controversy, and we can discover every phase and shade of opinion with some German name attached, from the ultra-Pauline views of Bengel to the most anti-Pauline (at least, in principle, if not in expression) of Michaelis in his later days. Bengel, followed by many, held that the Greek, as we have it, is S. Paul's own.

Michaelis, on second thoughts, considered it more probable that S. Paul was not the author; and this opinion, strange to say, he combines with the conviction that the Epistle was originally written in Hebrew, though the argument, which in all ages has weighed most against the Authorship of S. Paul, is founded upon the different style of the Greek; and to allow that the Greek is a translation would have seemed to most commentators like a concession that the original was the work of S. Paul. Michaelis* is worth quoting, if only to show the "desolating" effect of severe research. He seems to have reasoned himself into a state of nicely-balanced doubt about the author, and into the downright denial of our having even so much as heard the name of the translator. "The arguments, therefore," he says (c. xxiv., sec. 16), "on both sides of the question are nearly of equal weight; but, if there is any preponderance, it is in favour of the opinion that S. Paul was not the author." And of the translator he remarks (c. xxiv., sec. 14):—"Neither in any other book of the New Testament, nor in the works of any Christian writer of the first century, is there any resemblance to the style of this Epistle; it must have proceeded, therefore, from a person of whom we have no other writings now extant."

Of the modern Germans, and they are many, who withhold the

* Introduction to the New Testament. By John David Michaelis. Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German by Herbert Marsh, B.D. Cambridge. 1801.

Epistle from S. Paul, some say, with Luther, that Apollos was the author; some support Barnabas or others of the ancient claimants; some are content to ascribe it to a disciple of the Apostle, without venturing upon any closer determination.

Dean Alford, in his interesting *Prolegomena* to the Epistle, reminds us that Catholics no longer enjoy the same liberty of discussion as formerly. We give his words:—"Finally, the Council of Trent, in 1546, closed up the question for Romanists by declaring, 'Testamenti Novi . . . quatuordecim epistolæ Pauli Apos., ad Rom. &c., ad Hebræos.' So that the best divines of that church have since then had only that way open to them of expressing an intelligent judgment, which holds the matter of the Epistle to be S. Paul's, but the style and arrangement that of some other person: so Bellarmine, &c.; so Estius, in his introduction to the Epistle, which is well worth reading, as a remarkable instance of his ability and candour." The introductory dissertation from which we borrow these words, for lucid arrangement and compendious treatment, commands our admiration and even our gratitude, though we are too often forced to dissent from its conclusions. If the learned Dean had not, as we take it, grievously misapprehended the meaning of a passage from Origen, which he quotes at length, and from which he selects a sentence for the text of his discovery, he would no doubt have gone on to say, that the only way now open to Catholic divines of expressing an intelligent judgment is the very way which the great Alexandrian freely chose from all other ways long centuries before the infallible decree of Trent had been put forth to hamper the intelligence of the faithful.

We willingly, nay thankfully, admit that the field of discussion has been made much narrower by the definition of the Council. We only regret that it has not been made far more narrow, and that all the minor questions have not been "closed up" by a competent judge as satisfactorily as the main point at issue. Estius thinks that it would be impossible, without temerity, to deny that S. Paul is, at all events, the primary author of the Epistle. If, after some fourteen centuries of unanimity, and a few plain words from a General Council, we Catholics are unable to meet Protestant critics on their own ground of universal scepticism, or, as it would be phrased, unbiassed inquiry, we cannot consent to receive commiseration on that account. Men who are in possession of the truth need not lament that they are no longer obliged to go forth in quest of it. Still Catholics are not debarred by this foregone conclusion from their full right to investigate facts and to scrutinize arguments, and, while adhering upon higher motives to a conclusion which has been tendered to them ready formed for their unconditional acceptance, to judge for themselves with perfect freedom

how far history and criticism seem to bear it out. In matters of dogma Catholics certainly do not profess to be impartial, for faith and doubt cannot co-exist ; but neither are they prepared to admit what is often quietly assumed, that impartiality and private judgment always go hand in hand. There is a partiality inspired by love, but there is a partiality also which springs from hatred ; there is a mental bias produced by habits of obedience, but there is also a mental bias coming from natural antagonism, prejudice, the spirit of contradiction. What stanch, unflinching Protestant, for instance, of the good old Newdegate type, would or could for one brief moment hesitate to pin his faith on that solution of our present question which asserts Apollos for the author, did he but know that it was Luther who invented the idea, and that this one alone among all the rival theories had never been contaminated by the suffrage of a single Catholic name ?

It will be well, first, to examine into the history of the doubt ; and, secondly, to endeavour to account for its existence, and to trace it back to the origin. S. Clement of Rome, the helper of S. Paul, whose name was written in the Book of Life (Phil. iv. 3), quotes largely from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and cannot well have failed to know who its author was ; but unfortunately he had a habit of introducing all his Scripture texts with terribly indeterminate formulas : " For the Scripture says " ; " For so it is written " ; " And again elsewhere (Holy Scripture) sayeth." Only once does he mention an Epistle of S. Paul's with his name, and that is in chap. xlvii. of his letter to the Corinthians, where, without quoting any text, he reminds his readers of the Epistle which they had received from S. Paul. Certainly we cannot argue from this solitary passage that he would have been sure to tell us that S. Paul wrote to the Hebrews if only he had been aware of the fact. We can derive no argument one way or another from S. Clement ; neither can we argue back to S. Clement from Roman writers of a later date, and say that these could not have been ignorant that S. Paul was the author, and could still less have rejected him, unless S. Clement either had not known, or had not transmitted his knowledge. That S. Clement should not have known the Epistle as S. Paul's is difficult to conceive ; that, knowing this, he should not have imparted the knowledge to others is more difficult to conceive ; but that a tradition of the Pauline authorship of a letter, albeit perhaps started under the fairest auspices, should have been obscured, or even lost, in the hundred years intervening between Clement and Caius, interrupted as they were by persecution and hiding in catacombs,—this assuredly no one need feel any difficulty in admitting as possible, not to say probable. Because a Roman priest, about A.D. 200, says that S. Paul was not the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we

cannot, therefore, infer that the silence of S. Clement, about A.D. 100, was necessarily the silence of ignorance. Eusebius of Cæsarea is the first who mentions the testimony of Caius, or Gaius, and speaks of the feeling in the Roman Church. S. Jerome repeats the account, and brings down to his own time the observations of Eusebius, made some half a century before. In his "Catalogue of Illustrious Men," he says (c. 59) :—

In the Pontificate of Zephyrinus, Bishop of Rome, that is, in the time of Antoninus, son of Severus (or about A.D. 200), Gaius had a very famous dispute with a follower of Montanus, Proculus by name, whom he accused of rashness in defending the New Prophecy. In his work he enumerates only thirteen Epistles of Paul, saying that the fourteenth, commonly styled the Epistle to the Hebrews, is not one of his. And indeed, among the Romans to this day, it is not regarded as belonging to the Apostle Paul.

He says the same of the Romans in his letter to Dardanus, which we shall have occasion to quote soon. He says the same in his commentary on Isaias (l. 3 in Is. vi. 2), and again in his commentary on Zacharias (l. 2 in Zach. viii. 1).

There can be no doubt that the Roman Church, down to S. Jerome's time, gave little sign of accepting this Epistle as S. Paul's; indeed, the Romans seemed to have looked upon its canonicity as not fully established until after the time of S. Ambrose. But it is important for our future argument to remark, that the earliest testimony is purely negative. It avails to prove the existence of a doubt, but does not attain the dignity of a counter tradition. To S. Clement of Rome we may add S. Irenæus, who belongs alike to East and West, whose genuine writings contain no reference to the Epistle; and Novatian, the heresiarch, who was a priest of the Roman Church, though his influence was greatest in Africa. It is indeed a strong argument that S. Paul was not recognized in Rome for the author of the Epistle, to find even Novatian silent on the subject; for it would have served his purpose well to have found in the 6th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews an unquestioned Apostolic declaration in his favour; and his followers were not slow to discover, or scrupulous in making the most of their discovery, that some of the difficult things which S. Paul there says lend great countenance, at first sight, to their Jansenist-like rigorism.

Still, even Novatian's silence can prove nothing more than what has been freely granted, the existence of grave doubt; and if these negative arguments, in which the main strength of the Anti-Pauline cause is found, are to be deemed conclusive against S. Paul's authorship, they must be deemed no less conclusive against the canonicity of the Epistle. *Ipsi viderint.* Our German Pro-

testant friends, in their anxiety to get rid of S. Paul, are unconsciously arguing against themselves upon another count. Luther was at least consistent when he denied both the apostolicity of the Epistle and its authority.

In the African Church we find Tertullian denying, and S. Cyprian apparently ignorant of, S. Paul's share in the matter; and this seems the sum total of the evidence to be gathered in that portion of the Church up to the time of S. Augustine. Tertullian quietly, and without comment, in his Montanist work, "*De Pudicitia*," ascribes the Epistle to S. Barnabas.

S. Cyprian never uses the Epistle once. But this need scarcely surprise us; for not only was he a devoted admirer of Tertullian, and in literary matters a faithful follower, accustomed to settle knotty points of criticism by a compendious "*da magistrum*"; but, moreover, he was engaged in hot dispute with Novatian, and as long as Novatian was willing to keep aloof from the Epistle to the Hebrews, S. Cyprian would not be over eager to furnish his adversary with new weapons of attack, even supposing that he entertained on this point different views from his master.

By the time of S. Ambrose a change seems to have set in. This great bishop and doctor quotes the Epistle freely, and fearlessly ascribes it to S. Paul. In his treatise "*de Pœnit.*" he devotes two whole chapters (cc. ii. and iii.) to a vindication of Heb. vi., assuming it as S. Paul's.

It will be well to see what S. Jerome and S. Augustine thought about the subject before we pass on to the Eastern Church.

S. Jerome constantly quotes the Epistle, and ascribes it to S. Paul, as if he had no doubt on the point; but he mentions more than once, as we have seen, the doubt which existed in the Roman Church. Some remarks which he makes in his letter to Dardanus (Ep. 129, §. 3) are by many thought to outweigh all his practical acceptance of the Epistle. We must judge for ourselves. In this letter, then, to Dardanus, S. Jerome, after making in immediate succession four somewhat lengthy citations, which he introduces with the remark,—"The Vessel of Election speaketh to the Hebrews," concludes with a passage which is very celebrated in this controversy:—

"Those who belong to us" (*i.e.* Christians), he says, "will do right to maintain, that this Epistle, which bears title '*To the Hebrews*,' is accepted as coming from the Apostle Paul, not only by the Churches of the East, but by all the ecclesiastical writers in the Greek language down to the present day, although many of them (*plerique*)* deem it the work either of Barnabas or of Clement; and that it really matters not from whom we

* This translation is justified afterwards.

have it, seeing that it certainly is from some approved ecclesiastical writer, and is authorized by daily reading in the churches. If, however, the practice of the Latins does not give it admission among the Canonical Scriptures, neither, be it remembered, do the Churches of the Greeks accept with the same facility the Apocalypse of John; yet we accept both these works, by no means following herein the practice of these times, but yielding deference to the authority of ancient writers, who very frequently (*plerumque*) adduce testimonies both from the one and from the other, not as they are sometimes wont to deal with apocryphal writings (occasionally they draw instances even from pagan literature), but as canonical and ecclesiastical writings.*

There is a difficulty in this passage without doubt, and it even seems to contradict itself; but then Dean Alford's solution can scarcely be the right one. He pushes "*plerique*" to its fullest meaning, and then distinguishes between "*suscipi*" and "*arbitrentur*," assigning to the former term the narrow and exclusive sense of mere conventional accepting. His words are:—

Now, though these expressions are not very perspicuous, it is not difficult to see what is meant by them. A general conventional reception (*susceptio*) of the Epistle as S. Paul's prevailed among the Greeks. To this their writers (without exception, according to Jerome; but that is a loose assertion, as the preceding pages will show) conformed, still, in most cases, entertaining their own views as to Barnabas or Clement having written the Epistle, and thinking it of little moment, seeing that confessedly it was the work of a "*vir ecclesiasticus*," and was stamped with the authority of public reading in the churches.

This is ingenious and plausible enough; but, after admitting that the expressions are not very perspicuous, and that Jerome is making loose assertions, it would be a decidedly shorter way out of the difficulty to suppose that S. Jerome said "*plerique*," when it would have been better to have said "*plures*";† and then we

* "*Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, non solum ab ecclesiis Orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis Scriptoribus, quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabæ vel Clementis arbitrentur; et nihil interesse ejus sit, quum ecclesiastici viri sit, et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur. Quod si eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter Scripturas canonicas; nec Græcorum quidem ecclesiæ Apocalypsin Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt; et tamen nos utramque suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum Scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque abutuntur testimonio, non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent, quippe qui et Gentilium literarum raro utuntur exemplis, sed quasi canonicis et ecclesiasticis.*"

† Our rendering of "*plerique*" receives some countenance from the use in this very passage of the kindred word, "*plerumque*." Certainly S. Jerome did not mean to say that the ancient writers drew their quotations for the most part from the Epistle to the Hebrews and from the Apocalypse.

may dispense with all subtilizing about conventional "susceptio" as opposed to internal judgment, especially where the word "suscipere" is immediately after employed twice over in its ordinary and fuller sense, and we have only to say that he shows his own opinion pretty clearly by the terms in which he speaks of the Epistle, not only where he quotes from it in his other writings, but also in this very passage, in which, as we have seen, he starts his observations with a "*Vas electionis loquitur*"; and that, nevertheless, while he thus discloses to us his mind on the subject, he is laudably careful not to force his own opinion on the acceptance of his readers. Might we not call it conventionalism run mad, thus to preface with an emphatic assertion of S. Paul's authorship that very passage in which he was undertaking to show that S. Paul was not really the author after all? The habit of appealing to the "*Vas electionis*" must have been very deeply rooted indeed if, in the very act of declaring its inaccuracy, he could not refrain from using the offensive formula. Add to this, that if S. Jerome did mean "*plerique*" to be understood accurately, he would have intended to say what was either manifestly untrue, or a pure assertion, without proof or the possibility of proof. If we are to judge of what the Greek writers thought by referring to what they wrote, then, as we shall soon see, it is manifestly untrue that *most of them* (*plerique*) believed that the Epistle came from Clement or Barnabas. Olshausen (*Opuscula*, p. 95), quoted in the able summary of opinion upon the Epistle to the Hebrews in Dr. Smith's "*Dictionary of the Bible*," says:—"No one is named, either in Egypt or in Syria, Palestine, Asia, or Greece, who is opposed to the opinion that this Epistle proceeds from S. Paul."

If, on the other hand, we venture to say, that the Greek writers wrote one thing and thought another, how can this ever be anything but the purest of unprovable assertions? What means have we, or had S. Jerome, of arriving at such a conclusion? To divine the thoughts of men, who are lying in their graves, and this not only without any clue from their writings, but actually in contradiction to all they ever wrote, would be a perfection of clairvoyance to which S. Jerome certainly was a stranger, for we have not arrived at it yet. Can there be a greater absurdity than to explain what a man has actually said by what he may be imagined to have thought, instead of trying to make out what he must have thought by examining what he actually said? It is difficult to see why those rather random words in the letter to Dardanus ought to be taken as by themselves alone sufficing to outweigh the practice of a lifetime, and a practice persevered in at the very time when S. Jerome (according to those who wish to have him on their side as the opponent of the Pauline authorship) is apologising for that practice, and making what excuse he can to save its truthfulness at the expense of its accuracy.

S. Augustine like S. Jerome quotes freely from the Epistle, which he sometimes ascribes to S. Paul, though more frequently he commits himself to no statement about the author. Like S. Jerome, again, he is laudably careful to record the doubts of others. In the work *De Civitate Dei* (l. xvi. c. 22), we find after an allusion to Melchisedech the addition: "Of whom many glorious things are written in the Epistle inscribed to the Hebrews, which according to many is from the Apostle Paul, though this is denied by some."

These words were probably written about A.D. 416, and by that time we have had abundant proof of what S. Augustine himself thought about the Epistle. He was present as a priest at the Council of Hippo, A.D. 393, and as a bishop at the Third Council of Carthage, A.D. 398, and in both these Councils the Epistle was unequivocally ascribed to S. Paul.* In the acts of the latter Council (Can. 47: Labbe, t. 2, p. 1409) we find a list of the canonical books, exactly coinciding, except in the arrangement of some of the books of the Old Testament, with the Canon of Trent; and in their proper place we find, "thirteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul: one of the Hebrews by the same." An ancient copy bore an appended suggestion: "Let the Church across the sea be consulted touching the confirmation of this Canon." As a sufficient expression of what the Roman Church had by this time come to think on the subject, we may take the enumeration of canonical books in the letter of Innocent I., written in the year 405 (Ep. 6, ad Exsuperium Tolosanum, c. 7: Labbe, t. 3, p. 15), in which are included "fourteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul." Thenceforward we hear little more about Roman or African doubts. Not only at Councils in which he took a distinguished part, but expressly in so many words, and even before the year 400, S. Augustine had made his own profession of faith in his treatise, *De Doctrinâ Christianâ* (l. 2, c. 8), where he enumerates all the fourteen Epistles of S. Paul in their present order, saving that the two to the Thessalonians are put between the Philippians and Colossians. What does it matter to us, after this, if he introduces a quotation now and again with some such remark as (*De Civ. Dei*, l. 10, c. 5): "In the Epistle which is inscribed to the Hebrews"? Are we to infer that he himself did not believe in S. Paul's authorship, after his express declaration to the contrary? or are we rather to suppose that, as he has told us already in the passage quoted from the sixteenth book of the same work, he, no less than S. Jerome, was perfectly cognizant of the existence of a doubt not then closed up by competent authority, and that, with a modesty for which he was conspicuous in those days of hot polemics, he

* See Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* Syn. zu Hippo (vol. ii. p. 55).

refused to lay down the law dogmatically until Rome had spoken in a definition on the matter? To admit that a question is still open in the Church is certainly not the same thing as to express personal doubt on the subject. Both S. Jerome and S. Augustine in several places admit that the claims of the Epistle to the Hebrews had been, and still were, controverted; but to which side of the controversy they themselves incline ought, we think, to be clear enough from the practice of S. Jerome, to which his hazy letter to Dardanus is no way opposed, if it be explained according to the hermeneutics of common sense, and from the express words of S. Augustine, which are nowhere contradicted by his practice, and are often helped out by it.

The great African councils of S. Augustine's time were the first utterances of authority which we find about our Epistle, and how much of their inspiration is due to his master mind all church-historians know. It might be nearer to the truth, if, instead of accusing S. Augustine of anti-Pauline views, we were to say that he has done more perhaps than any other individual man to bring about the "closing up for Romanists" of all views but one, namely, that S. Paul was at any rate the primary author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

To pass now to the East.

Clement of Alexandria, whose words are given by Eusebius (H.E., l. 6, c. 14), affirms that S. Paul wrote the Epistle in Hebrew, and that S. Luke translated it, and he finds sufficient reason for the omission of S. Paul's name in his unpopularity with the Jews. Then he adds the reasons given by his master Pantænus, whom he calls "that blessed priest": these are, that S. Paul (Heb. iii. 1) calls Christ an Apostle, and cannot bring himself almost in the same breath to apply the same title to himself; and also, that he was writing to the Jews, not as their own special apostle, but as one undertaking a work of supererogation (*ἐκ περιουσίας*). Whether these reasons are so silly as to make the testimony of Pantænus of small value, we leave to Dean Alford to decide; for ourselves, we care more for the fact of the testimony; and perhaps, the more it is shown that the "blessed priest" was an old simpleton, the less likely it will appear that he was originating an entirely new idea, and the more likely it will appear that he was only telling what he had been told by others; that he was in fact witnessing to a tradition.

Clement of Alexandria in his constant practice bears out his expressed conviction. We find him quoting the Epistle boldly as S. Paul's, quite undeterred by any consideration of the part which, according to him, S. Luke had had in reducing it to what was then, as now, the only known form. Origen did not adopt

his master's opinion about the translation. His words deserve, and shall hereafter receive, a careful examination.

After Origen's time the Alexandrine writers to a man held the Pauline authorship; and this means much, for they were the critics of their age; and it may be as well to remark that they were also the natural interpreters of the meaning of their own great Doctor. Dean Alford not only allows, but insists, that the after-practice was traceable to Origen's influence; it was, in other words, not only "post," but also "propter." Before relating how the idea of the Pauline authorship spread rapidly through all the Eastern Church, he rightly cautions the student against the juvenile error of attaching too much importance to the mere multiplication of witnesses. But he certainly pushes this principle too far. Witnesses who blindly follow the lead of their principal are, of course, for any moral weight that their testimony could add, to be regarded as mere ciphers, if not worse; but it is an assertion as startling as it is sweeping, it is an assertion which would be very much the better for a little proving, to say that all the Fathers of the Alexandrine, Asiatic, African, and Roman Churches, who lived after a given date, were blindly following the lead of one or two master spirits who went before. Eusebius of Cæsarea, S. John Chrysostom, S. Basil, S. Gregory of Nazianzum, and not a few more, were men eminently able to think for themselves. They were not in other matters by any means slavish imitators of one another, or of antecedent doctors; if anything, they erred through too great freedom and boldness in their speculations, wherever they did not recognize the presence of overbearing tradition. In all questions open to discussion they manifested a striking originality of thought, and it is altogether too much to ask us to believe that in this particular matter of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* they were eager to surrender their intellectual freedom to the *ipso dixit* of a man whom most of them, however unjustly, regarded as a heretic. Of course they never attempted to deny his learning, but they were less disposed to trust implicitly to one who was known to be not always a safe guide. We may be sure that his criticisms were tested by some of these Greek minds, and that they were accepted, not blindly, but upon convincing proof. They must too have had many independent sources of information altogether unknown to us.

To return to Origen. Eusebius of Cæsarea has embalmed in his *Church History* (l. vi. c. 25), and thus preserved to our day, two pregnant fragments of the great Alexandrian.

In the first he declares: "That the diction of the *Epistle* entitled '*To the Hebrews*' does not betray the simplicity of speech peculiar to the Apostle, who says of himself that he is unskilled in words, that is to say, in studied language; but that the *Epistle* is

more thoroughly Greek in its style of composition, as every one competent to pronounce upon differences of idiom will confess. And again, that the thoughts are admirable, and not inferior to the undisputed writings of the Apostle, as every one conversant with his writings will readily allow."

The second fragment runs thus: "If I were to give my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are the Apostle's, but that the phraseology and construction are the work of some one who jotted down the apostolic utterances, and put them together after the fashion of a scholar taking notes of what his master has said. If then any Church hold this Epistle to be Paul's, it deserves respect for its opinion; for it is not without reason that those who lived before us have handed it down as Paul's. But who is the writer of the Epistle, to tell the truth, God He knoweth. In the account, as it comes down to us, we have some asserting that it was Clement, sometime Bishop of Rome, who wrote this letter; and others that it was Luke, the same that wrote the Gospel and the Acts."*

Now, in this last passage, we must, with Dean Alford's leave, maintain that Origen lays down his judgment of the authorship as clearly as it can be conveyed in words, at least without the aid of *italics*. That judgment we do aver to be that the thoughts (τὰ νοήματα), as distinguished from the words, are S. Paul's, and that the words belong to somebody else. No other sense can we extract after not one, nor two, but twenty readings. This interpretation seems the obvious one, and at the same time the one which is best borne out by study of the context and of all the adjuncts. When the writer has just been saying that the words belong to somebody else (τινός), how very natural it is that he should follow up such a remark by further remarking, that only God knows who this "somebody else" is; and how very unnatural that, with a "somebody" close at hand and ready to lay claim to any expression of uncertainty, he should

"Ετι πρὸς τοῦτοις περὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς ἐν ταῖς εἰς αὐτὴν ὁμιλίαις ταῦτα διαλαμβάνειν·

"ὅτι ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τοὔτεστι τῇ φράσει· ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθεσὶς τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φράσεων διαφορὰς ὁμολογήσαι ἀν. πάλιν τε αὖ ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσιά ἐστι, καὶ οὐ δεύτερα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων, καὶ τοῦτο ἀν συμφήσαι εἶναι ἀληθὲς πᾶς ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ."

τούτοις μὲν ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων·

"ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἶποιμ' ἀν ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικά, καὶ ὥσπερ ἐσχολιογραφῆσαντος τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. Εἰ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη ἐνδοκιμείτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παῦλον αὐτὴν παραδεδώκαν· τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς Θεὸς οἶδεν. ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ὑπὸ τινων μὲν λεγόντων ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἐγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, ὑπὸ τινων δὲ, ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις."

nevertheless intend those words of doubt to be referred, not to this same convenient "somebody," but to the very subject upon which he has been expressing his own personal opinion in forcible terms. There is not a syllable to lead us to suppose that he is making a distinction between the judgment which he had formed upon critical grounds, and the judgment which he had formed upon grounds of historical tradition. He simply gives his opinion, founded, we presume, upon all that he knew of the Epistle itself, and of tradition concerning it; and he gives it as his opinion and nothing more, because confessedly the question was open till long after his time. On the other hand, he does make an unmistakable distinction between the thoughts and the words, and between the conceiver of the thoughts and the composer of the words. After he has in point of fact started with this distinction, there ought to be no great difficulty in permitting him to revert to it immediately after. And yet it is upon this imaginary difficulty that the one only argument against our interpretation is founded.

Alford thinks that in the clause, "who is the writer" (*τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας*), the word which we translate "writer" cannot possibly have that meaning as opposed to "author," because in the very same sentence it is used of S. Luke, who was author, as well as writer, of the Gospel and the Acts (Prolegom., § 21); in other words, we cannot consider the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews as separable from the author, unless we also agree to consider S. Luke the writer, as separable from S. Luke the author, of the Gospel and the Acts. Really no one need hesitate to accept the alternative with all its consequences. Even though S. Luke did originate, as well as write, the Gospel and the Acts, we have the most unfettered liberty to think of him under either point of view, or under both; and if we did choose to speak of him as a writer, without caring to make any statement about his authorship, we should have the most perfect right to do so, and in so doing we should probably use some form of the very word which is employed by Origen. Can I not say that the moon shines less brightly than the sun, without being understood to maintain that the moon shines by its own proper light? And yet "shines," when applied to the sun, might just as fairly be taken to include both ideas, of imparting and of originating light, as Origen's word, when applied to S. Luke, can be taken to include the two ideas of writing and originating a letter. Every one knows that S. Luke both wrote and originated what he wrote; and everybody knows that the sun both shines and originates its own sunshine. If then the natural meaning of the word in question is the actual writer, the reducer of thoughts into written language, without any necessary allusion to the prime source whence those thoughts were borrowed: if two sentences back Origen has drawn a distinction between

author and writer, recording his deliberate judgment about the former, and his complete uncertainty about the latter: if, moreover, that deliberate judgment is borne out by his constant practice; for with him, as with so many other Fathers, the rule holds good, that, while he is careful to commemorate the doubts of others, it does not seem to occur to him that he ought to doubt for himself: if, in fine, the complete uncertainty expressed by the words, "God, He knoweth," more naturally belongs to that other complete uncertainty expressed in the word "somebody else," than it belongs to that deliberate judgment here passed by Origen upon the apostolic authorship, confirmed as it is elsewhere by copious and confident citation; if all these things be so, why may not Origen have spoken of the writer as opposed to the author?

Origen never meant that only God knew who the author was; (1) because he never said it: (2) because his practice gives no support to such an idea: (3) because his successors in the Alexandrian Church, who took their cue from him, do not seem to have so understood him.

Origen and Clement differing, as they did, only on a minor point, and thoroughly agreed upon the great question of the Pauline authorship, were sure to influence their own disciples and their children's children, and we are glad to be able to defer so far to Dean Alford's judgment, as to admit the needlessness of quoting a long line of Alexandrian prelates, who without one dissentient voice received the Epistle to the Hebrews as S. Paul's.

And yet it would be too much to say that even all of these were merely blind and reckless followers of the arbitrary decision of any private doctor, however great. It is enough to say that the series includes the names of Athanasius, the Church's champion at Nicæa, and Cyril, who presided at Ephesus as the representative of Pope Celestine. S. Antony, too, the great patriarch of monks, was fond of the Epistle, and quotes it as S. Paul's. (Cf. Epp. XI., XVII., XVIII., &c.) So also S. Isaias, another Egyptian abbot (cf. Oratio XIII., &c.), and S. Macarius the Great, who quotes the Epistle very frequently, and sometimes calls it S. Paul's. (Cf. Hom. 49, § 4, &c.)

The Fathers of the Eastern Church, outside Alexandria and Egypt, must not be passed over so summarily. They have as good a right as any men that ever lived to be considered independent witnesses.

S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, first on the list, was, it is true, a friend and scholar of Origen, and as such might be suspected. He quotes the Epistle, and as S. Paul's, but he makes less use of it than does Origen's declared enemy, S. Methodius, Bishop of Tyre. (Cf. *Convivium decem Virginum*, Or. 5. c. 7.) This illustrious bishop suffered martyrdom about the year A.D. 312. He was, according to

S. Epiphanius (Hær., 64, § 63), a man of learning and remarkably zealous for the truth, and by S. Jerome he is spoken of (Comment. in Dan., c. 13) as "a most eloquent man and a martyr." Eusebius passes him by in silence, apparently in indignation at his attack upon Origen.

Eusebius (of Cæsarea) himself, who died in 340, albeit a great admirer of Origen, was too learned a man, and far too much of an original investigator, to receive his canon of Scripture at even a friend's dictation; and to say otherwise, is to do him grievous wrong. Besides, he agreed rather with Clement of Alexandria; than with Origen; for he considered the Greek a translation (H. E., iii. 38);* yet he did not agree altogether even with Clement, for he thought that S. Clement of Rome, not S. Luke, was the translator. We have only to open the commentaries of Eusebius at random to find his opinion. (Cf. *e.g.* in Ps. xli. 4-8, Ps. xlix. 2, Ps. xci. 2-3, Ps. xcii. 1, Ps. xciv. 8, Ps. xcviii. 9; De Eccles. Theologia, l. 3, c. 3, &c.)

S. James of Nisibis, in Mesopotamia, may speak for the Armenian Church. He was a contemporary of Eusebius. (Cf. *e.g.* Sermo VIII.)

Titus, Bishop of Bostra, in Arabia, who died before A.D. 378, is another witness. (Cf. *Adversus Manichæos*, l. iii. c. 4.) Both S. Jerome and Sozomen speak of his learning and eloquence. Sozomen (H.E., l. iii. c. 14) ranks him among the illustrious men of his time. Julian the Apostate honoured Titus with his personal enmity.

The other names we have to quote are too well known to require an introduction, even with those who have made no special study of Church history.

S. Basil the Great (ob. A.D. 379) quotes largely from the Epistle, and attributes it to S. Paul. (Cf. *e.g.* Ep. 38, § 6.)

S. Gregory of Nyssa, his brother, does the same. (Cf. *de Virginitate*, c. 22.)

S. Gregory of Nazianzum (ob. 389) says that this Epistle has the true "ring" about it.†

S. Cyril of Jerusalem (ob. 386) expressly says it is S. Paul's (Catech. xv. § 28).

S. Epiphanius, whose life stretched across almost a century, from A.D. 308 to A.D. 403, seems never to have doubted about the Pauline authorship. (Cf. *e.g.* Hær., 66, § 80.)

* Eusebius is not necessarily inconsistent in thinking (Comment. in Ps. ii. 7) that S. Paul, who commonly used the LXX., had the LXX. version in view when he wrote Heb. i. 5.

† *τινὲς δὲ φασὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους εὐθὺς, οὐκ εὖ λέγοντες γνησία γὰρ ἢ χάρις.*

(Carm., l. 2, sec. ii. l. 308.)

S. Ephrem of Edessa, the Syrian, who died in the same year with S. Basil, is another valuable witness. (Cf. *e.g.* t. 2, *Serm.* in 2m Domini Adventum.)

Add to these Amphilochius (ob. circ. A.D. 392), who, alluding in a fragment to Heb. i. 14, ascribes it to the Apostle, and there will only remain unnoticed one of the stars of that great Oriental constellation which illumined the Church at the close of the fourth century.

That star which we reserve for special inspection is S. John Chrysostom. It would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that the ruling passion of his life was admiration of S. Paul. In season and out of season his eloquence is ever recurring to this loved theme. We have only to read the glowing words in his best-known work, *De Sacerdotio* (l. vi. c. 6), to assure ourselves of the depth of his love and reverence for the great Apostle. Love is blind, but only to the defects, not to the identity of the person beloved. S. Chrysostom, with his passionate devotion to S. Paul, had thrown himself into the study of his Epistles. He had tried to imbibe their spirit, and may well seem to have succeeded. Would not such a mind as his at once detect, and such a heart as his almost know by instinct, no matter how disguised, the genuine tones of that familiar voice? And would not the smallest misgiving about the authenticity have shown itself in his dealings with the suspected Epistle? Yet nowhere is there a trace of any disadvantageous comparison of the Epistle to the Hebrews with the other writings of the much-cherished master. Immediately after he has been lauding to the sky yet once again S. Paul and his Epistles, he takes the opportunity of noticing the reason which induced S. Paul to omit his name at the beginning of this Epistle. "The Epistles of Paul," he says, "are mines and well-springs of spiritual wealth:—mines, because they furnish us with treasure of higher price than any gold:—well-springs, because they never fail." Then he subjoins a little lower down: "Always when writing to others, he puts his name at the beginning of his Epistles, but he did nothing of the sort when he was writing to the Hebrews. Without writing any introduction, without saying who he was, or to whom he was writing, as it had been his wont to do, he started off at once with the words: God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to our fathers. This was prudence on Paul's part. In order that his letter might not share his own unpopularity, he hid himself under a kind of mask by suppressing his name, &c." S. John Chrysostom, therefore, so jealous of the honour of S. Paul, and so deeply versed in all that appertained to the Apostle and his writings, seems to have been utterly unmoved by all the suspicions, certainly not unknown to him, which had been long harboured in the Western Church. But by this time S. Ambrose had spoken out, and

S. Augustine was at work with all the influence of his great name to change controversy into unanimity ; and this, be it observed, not by trying, Western, as he was, to reduce the East to acknowledge the justice of those ancient doubts of Rome, but by invoking the aid of an authoritative voice to silence those doubts, and to proclaim the truth of that numerously attested, and stoutly defended Oriental tradition. From this time we have nothing but unwavering consent in theory and in practice. Theodoret of Cyre, the well-known historian, begins the preface to his commentary on the *Epistle to the Hebrews* by severely rebuking the Arians for not receiving the *Epistle* as coming from S. Paul. We meet occasionally afterwards an historical notice of the doubts which had existed, but only by way of making it more clear that they existed no longer. There was only one mind in the Church about the Pauline origin of this *Epistle* from thenceforward till the time of Cajetan (ob. 1535) and Erasmus (ob. 1536). Cajetan was considered to have treated Scripture with far too great freedom, and, as he was not familiar with Hebrew, he was at the mercy of the Rabbi, to whom he went as to a fountain-head of sound interpretation of the Old Testament. He used the same liberty of private judgment in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, which from intrinsic reasons he deems not only not Pauline, but not even canonical. For this rash assertion he is properly taken to task by Ambrosius Catharinus, himself a bold and original thinker, and by many others. Estius and Bellarmine give some of his arguments against the canonicity ; and if he had no better than these to bring, Cajetan richly deserved the abuse that he received.*

Erasmus, though such a friend and favourite of Protestantism, was content to leave the canonicity unassailed, but he expressed his decided opinion that S. Paul was not the author. He seems to have been chiefly influenced by the doubting mode of citation adopted by both S. Jerome and S. Augustine, and of course also by that unfortunate letter to Dardanus, which is well calculated to mystify any one, and which yet, as we have seen, cannot, unless we attribute to the writer either downright falsification of history or

* Here are two specimens (Bellarm. de Verbo Dei, l. i. c. 17). "Argumentum 6tum est Cajetani in commentario hujus epistolæ. Auctor hujus epistolæ probat cap. 1. Christum esse Filium Dei ex illis verbis libro 2. Reg. c. 7 : *Ego ero illi in patrem* ; et hæc verba intelliguntur ad literam de Salomone, et solum ex literali consensu sumuntur argumenta firma : igitur vel iste auctor non est Paulus, vel Paulus non solide argumentatur" * * *

"Argum. 7m ejusdem Cajetani est. Ad Heb. 9 dicit Auctor fuisse in arca urnam habentem manna et virgam Aaron, quæ fronderat, et tabulas legis : sed l. 3. Regum, c. 8, solæ tabulæ referuntur fuisse in arca ; igitur aut mentitur Paulus, aut hujus epistolæ auctor non est Paulus."

the most audacious and unfounded assertion, bear the meaning which Erasmus, Alford, and others wish to attach to it.

We have seen also how that hesitating style of citation is amply accounted for by the mere consciousness of the existence of great doubt on the subject. Still, though we cannot allow that Erasmus had sufficient reason for adopting even the milder half of Cajetan's *uncatholic* teaching, it is quite unnecessary to call him a heretic on the point. Even after the dogmatic decree of Trent, Estius, as we have said, would not call it more than "*temerarious*" to deny the authorship, as long as the canonicity was admitted.

We may sum up the history of the external evidence upon the authorship of our Epistle, by repeating that the most ancient testimonies quoted on the subject are purely negative. Those who could have spoken from their own personal knowledge either never transmitted what they knew, or the record has perished in the transmission. Had the early evidence been decisive, the controversy would never have arisen. The earliest positive evidence on the subject is at variance in the East and West. In the West there was a widespread and very real doubt about everything connected with the Epistle. In the East there was the consciousness of the existence of that doubt in the West, joined with a wonderful unanimity in refusing to sanction, or take home, the doubt. As time went on, the Easterns became more and more immovable in their opinion, and the Westerns, little by little, abandoned their doubts, and opened their minds to firm conviction and peaceful assurance.

It may not be amiss to remark, in passing, that ordinarily human minds proceed contrariwise. Objective truth alone, revealed or recognized, can change subjective doubt into subjective certainty; whilst, if a little time be granted, it is the easiest thing in life to shake mere human conviction, resting on an *ipse dixit* even of Origen.

There existed, then, in early times, at least in the Western Church, a most unmistakable doubt about the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It must now be our business to investigate the causes of this doubt, and to trace it back to its starting-point. Was it well founded? Was it so founded that scholars and critics, unbiassed by any infallible teaching, and free to pursue "intelligent inquiry," would be forced to confess that S. Paul had, at the best, but a very ambiguous claim to be regarded as the author? In other words, do Catholics hold the Pauline authorship just merely because they cannot help themselves, and have no liberty to think as they like in the matter, or are they well able to make out a good case for their opinion, and can they show that here, as elsewhere, reason and dogma are in harmony? When we try to investigate the origin of the doubt, we recognize at the outset

two evident, though perhaps only partial causes, one negative and one positive. Both have been already more than hinted at in the previous rapid historical sketch. The first is the insufficiency of primitive tradition; the second is the manifold discrepancy, which seems to sever at once and hopelessly this Epistle from the universally acknowledged thirteen of S. Paul. The total absence of primitive tradition would of course, by itself alone, have been cause enough of subsequent doubt; but we need not suppose that, in the early Church, there was the same total dearth of information that meets us now. The tradition might well have existed, and yet have been too weak to cope with the other strong and positive cause of doubt, the intrinsic difference of style. There might have been a strong leaning in the minds of the faithful to the idea of Pauline origin, but, for want of one single downright testimony to counteract the intrinsic evidence, such a tendency might be gradually weakened till it died away. This could not have been if S. Clement of Rome had only introduced one of his many quotations with the words: "The Vessel of Election speaketh." That, which in S. Jerome's letter to Dardanus has, by hypercritical interpreters, been construed into a conventionalism, could not have been so misunderstood in a letter written by the disciple of S. Paul himself. In fact, if S. Clement had adopted another method of quotation, there would have been one dispute the less in Christendom, and it would never have been given to mankind to know all the treasures of logic and research which a few plain words had forfeited; those intricate windings of German ingenuity, those evenly balanced arguments which left poor Michaelis where they found him, only with a more bewildering sense of hopelessness. The insufficiency of primitive tradition was only a negative cause. It was absolutely needed to give the other causes room to work, but we have no reason to suppose that it was complete enough to be itself the source of the doubt.

The other and positive cause which meets us on the threshold of our inquiry, is, as has been said, the manifold discrepancy between this Epistle and the others of S. Paul. The exordium is startlingly different: the phraseology is different, methodically and systematically different throughout: there are some expressions (ii. 3) which at first sight seem inconsistent with S. Paul's position and authority, so jealously vindicated in his other Epistles. Behold amply enough to create grave doubt in the minds of those who were not deeply convinced of S. Paul's authorship.

But it is not precisely with the doubt itself, nor yet precisely with the causes of the doubt, that we have to deal. We want to trace the operation of those causes, not for their own sake, or for anything to which they led, but simply in order to discover that previous certainty, which they succeeded in changing into doubt.

The doubt, as we find it established in the earliest direct testimony, is not the aboriginal state of the subject. At first it was certain, either that S. Paul wrote, or that S. Paul did not write, the letter. Now, from which of these contradictory certainties was the doubt, as we have it, evolved, and fashioned by the operation of the causes above specified? What was the "*materia ex qua*" of the later doubt, the raw material from which it was fashioned? This is the single point at issue.

The actual genesis of the doubt is well beyond the reach of our inquiry. Where all is hypothesis, we are, in reason, bound to take the more simple solution. We are not at liberty to take a less likely solution, merely because it is a possible way out of the difficulty, for that would be to effect an arbitrary and capricious, not a logical settlement of the dispute. Therefore the question narrows itself to this: is it more easy to suppose that some disciple of S. Paul wrote the letter, and that the master's name in course of time supplanted the scholar's; or to suppose that S. Paul wrote the letter himself, and that his authorship afterwards became doubtful? Alford and the modern Germans maintain the former alternative; we defend the latter.

To defend the former is to say, that the master's name was actually substituted for the disciple's, at least to a sufficient extent to start a doubt.

To defend the latter is to say, that some one was accused of substituting the master's name for the disciple's.

Therefore the question narrows itself still farther. Is it easier to suppose that some one changed the author, or to suppose that some one said that some one else had changed the author?

The question simplified into this form may be taken as answering itself, but it will be better to work out the argument. Our thesis, then, is this: that it is *much more easy* to account for the later doubt upon the hypothesis that S. Paul himself was the author of the Epistle, than upon the hypothesis which ascribes it to one of his disciples.

Those who contest S. Paul's claims consider nothing more easy than to suppose that the letter was written by a disciple of S. Paul, and that the lesser name, as time went on, was gradually merged in the greater, and so came ere long to be entirely lost. If they cared to prove this assertion, which they do not, I fancy their argument would probably run somewhat thus:—

Daily experience, they might say, is enough to show us how easy it is to father an anecdote, or a good saying, upon Sheridan, or Talleyrand; or a practical joke upon Theodore Hook; or a genuine bull upon Sir Boyle Roche. So, by parity of reasoning, nothing is more easy than to suppose that a letter of such merit as the Epistle to the Hebrews, going begging for an author in the early

Church, should come to be fathered upon S. Paul. Yes ; but, then, before we proceed any farther, how came the letter to go begging for an author ? It was not anonymous from the beginning, like the letters of Junius. Nobody seriously supposes that the author was unknown to his first readers and hearers. Then, how came he to be unknown to their descendants ? It was known at first that S. Barnabas, we will say, wrote the letter, but his name was not down in black and white. All the first generation of Christians knew that the letter was his ; therefore, also, all of the second generation, who cared to know it, knew it ; and as long as any number of the faithful cared to know whose the letter was, it is not easy to see how they lost sight of S. Barnabas ; and neither is it easy to understand how they could have taken a deep and universal interest in the subject-matter of the Epistle, and have shown at the same time a great and universal carelessness about its author.

There is this difference between witty sayings and bulls and anecdotes on the one hand, and letters on the other, that the story or joke has what excellence it has quite independently of, or with very faint reference to, its prime originator ; whilst a letter and its writer are so bound up together that the writer's name may be said to be of the essence of the writing. Any letter which is worthy of the name ; any letter which is not a mere string of unimpassioned syllogisms ; any letter which, like our Epistle, is redolent of personal feeling and individuality, ought to be, and always will be, a reflex of the writer's mind—the words that his pen has traced are but his fugitive thoughts, caught and pinioned, and held firmly down. How often do we see in a picture some face full of meaning and character, which forces the conviction upon us that it is a likeness and not an ideal. Who can see such a picture, and know that it is a likeness, and catch the play of character that gives reality to those features, yet never care to inquire who is the original ? A letter would be shorn of more than half its force if the receiver or possessor did not know whence it came, unless he knew at least this much, that the author was some great unknown determined to remain unknown. The more excellent the letter, the more anxious all would be to learn its author's name. This amply explains the anxiety shown in later times to discover, or to fix beyond dispute, the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews ; but it makes it difficult, if not impossible, to admit, in the case of the early Christians, that indifference which the anti-Pauline hypothesis involves. If there had been from the beginning, as there must have been, the same solicitude about the author, how could his name have fallen through ? Truly, if Barnabas, or Luke, or Silas, or Clement wrote the letter, this difficulty seems insuperable.

It is safer sometimes to put a question vaguely. Can anything be easier, we are asked, than to suppose that *somehow or other* the

lesser name got merged in the greater, and the moonlight was drowned in the sunshine? Can anything be easier? Yes, this is easier. It is easier to shake an existing tradition, than to set a new tradition in train. It is easier to pull down than to build up. It is easier to suggest doubts and suspicions than to spread positive information. If our opponents will have it that it is easy and natural to suppose that the epistle sent by S. Barnabas was *actually* fathered upon S. Paul, then it is at least more easy and more natural to suppose that some one threw out a hint that perhaps this had been done, that perhaps the Epistle believed to be S. Paul's had only been fathered upon him. Nothing more would be wanted. It would be as the spark to the powder. The intrinsic evidence of the letter itself would alone suffice to make such a suggestion plausible. The suspicion would gain wings at once, and with the non-Pauline Greek, and the non-Pauline exordium, and the manifold divergence from S. Paul's strongly-marked and well-known style, to add what would seem like proof positive to that which was but a surmise in reality, the wonder would be small indeed if many men gave in to the idea that some lesser name had in fact been merged in the greater name of Paul; for there is not a shadow of difficulty in saying this, or in thinking it, but all the whole difficulty lies in doing it.

Thus, taking the uncertainty about the authorship of the Epistle for an historical fact, we have a better right to solve it for S. Paul's authorship than against it, provided always the intrinsic evidence be not strong enough to force us from our position. It will be necessary to glance at the discrepancies several times alluded to already; for if they be, indeed, not only at first sight startling, as we have admitted, but on mature investigation incompatible with Pauline authorship, then the argument, which we have just been tracing out, loses all force at once, for it is confessedly built upon hypothesis, and hypothesis is powerless in the face of facts.

If, however, these startling discrepancies admit of a fair and natural solution, then have we the very state of things, the very set of circumstances which, had we been free to choose, we should have chosen, in order to bear out, to ratify, to clinch the hypothesis on which we have been building. I mean we have exactly what is required in order to account satisfactorily for the phenomena as we find them; and the very discrepancies themselves, instead of presenting any fresh difficulty, furnish us with the key to the whole question.

But if, furthermore, on sinking the shaft deeper, we find that the discrepancies are only surface-soil, and that all is good ore below; if we find, as we labour on, that the singularities of the Epistle seem to grow fewer and fainter, till they are altogether outnumbered and outweighed by the underlying solid evidence of Apostolic

agency which grows upon our notice evermore, we have herein not only another and a strong confirmation of our hypothesis, but an additional strong and independent proof of the Pauline authorship.

Of these discrepancies the first and most obvious is the absence of that opening salutation so characteristic of the Apostle, which is invariably present in the thirteen acknowledged Epistles:—Paul, the servant of Jesus Christ, called to the Apostolate, set apart for the Gospel of God; Paul, appointed Apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God; Paul, the Apostle, constituted not by men, nor through the mediation of man, but through Christ Jesus and God the Father; Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ according to the commandment of God our Preserver, and Jesus Christ our Hope; or, Paul, the servant of God and the Apostle of Jesus Christ; or, Paul the Prisoner of Christ Jesus; or, in the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, simply, Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus to the Church of the Thessalonians.

If the Epistle to the Hebrews had had the name of Paul for its opening word, though, no doubt, some keen critics would have looked upon it as a marginal note incorporated into the text, there would probably never have been sufficient controversy on the subject to compel us to devote this essay to its elucidation; but it is a fact calling for comment and explanation, that in this Epistle alone, of all that are ascribed to S. Paul, the name and its concomitants are alike missing from the title-page.

Of course, we might say that S. Paul had every right to make an exception if he liked to a rule of his own framing; and we cannot irresistibly infer that, because in thirteen epistles he adopted one style of salutation, therefore he could not have indited a fourteenth with a perfectly unique commencement; but it is desirable to do something more than merely show that S. Paul's opponents cannot prove their point.

Clement of Alexandria accounts for the omission simply and satisfactorily. We have already heard his reason from S. John Chrysostom, who was sufficiently satisfied with it to make it his own.

He (Clement) remarks that it is natural that the name, "Paul the Apostle" does not occur at the beginning; for, when addressing the Hebrews, who were prejudiced and full of suspicion against him (S. Paul), he shows great judgment in not alienating their sympathies at the outset by the mention of his name.

Eusebius quotes Clement as follows:—

(Eus. H. E., l. 6, c. 14):—*μη προγεγράφθαι δὲ τὸ, Παῦλος ἀπόστολος εἰκότως Ἑβραίοις γὰρ φησὶν ἐπιστέλλων, πρόληψιν εἰληφόσι κατ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑποπεύουσιν αὐτὸν, συνετῶς πάνν οὐκ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτοὺς τὸ ὄνομα θεῖς.*

This seems likely enough. Clement thinks that S. Paul acted sensibly (*συνερώς*) in dropping his name, and it is a pleasure to agree with Clement. S. Paul, it is quite certain, was no favourite with the Jerusalem Jews, and might easily wish to avoid causing irritation by prematurely parading an unwelcome name. He might like to give his arguments every chance of sinking in before he made any allusion to himself. When once the desired impression had been produced, any animosity which might survive the softening influence of his glowing words, would be comparatively harmless. This idea, thrown out by Clement of Alexandria, is in perfect harmony with the tone of the entire Epistle, which, though there runs through it an indefinable grandeur, and a something that tells of real authority, is yet strikingly conciliatory and unassuming. In this it differs very widely from the Epistle to the Romans. That was almost fierce in its denunciations. This is, as he calls it himself (xiii. 22), a "*verbum solatii*." "And I beseech you, brethren, that you suffer this word of consolation. For I have written to you in a few words." That is, few words if compared with all he had to say. From this verse some have deduced that the Epistle to the Hebrews was meant to be rather a treatise than an epistle properly so called; but, if this be said of the Hebrews, then the same will have to be said of the Romans; for, in general arrangement, length, and proportion of parts, these two Epistles are as similar as they are unlike in tone and style.

The words which follow those just quoted sound Paul-like enough:—"Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty: with whom (if he come shortly) I will see you." "Salute all your prelates and all the saints. The brethren from Italy salute you, Grace be with you all. Amen."

There is a difficulty, founded on ii. 3, of which Erasmus and Cajetan make very much, but which we may justly consider extremely frivolous. The verse runs thus:—"How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation? which, having begun to be declared by the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him."

How could S. Paul, it is asked, have dreamed of including himself in this way among those to whom the tidings of salvation had been confirmed by others who had heard them? If there is one thing about which he is properly jealous, it is to insist upon the directness of his Divine Commission. Hear him addressing the Galatians (i. 11, 12):—"For I give you to understand, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached by me is not according to man: for neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

We are asked if one and the same man could write both these

passages consistently. No figure of speech, it is urged, no oratorical confounding of the speaker with his audience, will account for such discrepancies as this. But there is a very simple reply. We may explain the words how we like, but here is the fact. Whether these words can or cannot contain such a figure of speech, there can be no reasonable doubt that they do in fact contain it, as any one, by referring two verses back, may prove to his own satisfaction. The writer of the Epistle is constantly throughout this part identifying himself with his hearers:—"Therefore ought we more diligently to observe the things which we have heard, lest perhaps we should let them slip. For if . . . how shall we escape," &c.

Add to this that the obnoxious "unto us" may be explained without any violence in the sense of "down to our times"; and then consider, too, that words which could find no place where he is asserting his authority, as in Romans and Galatians, or even where he is speaking on indifferent subjects, may nevertheless very well find room in the second chapter of an epistle in which, if it may be so expressed, he sinks his apostleship at starting, and lets it peep out only gradually and modestly afterwards. The Doctor of the Gentiles, who, in his thirst for souls and his readiness to make himself all things to all men, submitted to defunct ceremonies, having his head shaved, and comporting himself as a Nazarite, to conciliate, at the request of S. James (Acts xxi.), the Jewish converts in Jerusalem, was not the man to shrink from such an innocent turn of rhetoric as this identification of orator and audience must be allowed to be. S. Augustine, who fought so long and well, and carried his point, that S. Peter at Antioch must have been in some way "reprehensibilis," or Holy Scripture could never have said that he was, found nothing to offend his nice sense of the truthfulness of inspired writing in this second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and certainly he ascribed this "figure of speech" to none other than S. Paul.

It remains that we assign a sufficient reason for the great diversity of style and diction, which marks off this letter from the uncontroverted thirteen. That there is this diversity is obvious to even a casual reader of the Greek. It is not a phrase here and there, or the turn of a sentence only, but it is an all-pervading difference of style. It will not be necessary to prove an assertion which nobody cares to contest. We have seen what Origen says on the subject, and he is a better judge on such a point than perhaps any mortal man can ever be again: and from Origen's days to the present time there has been but one opinion, that any one capable of forming an opinion is sure to detect a wide difference between this Epistle and the others of S. Paul. The words are different, the constructions are different, the eloquence itself is

of a different type. Even Professor Hug* admits the difference, though he is content to ascribe it to the effects of the course of education to which the Apostle had been subjected.

"Having been (we quote the Professor) for a long time led about from one tribunal to another, and having been obliged to be his own advocate and speaker, he perfected himself in a fluency which was ready to be applied to the first occasion." (Supplement, section 142.) And again: "The more I become acquainted with the writings of the Apostle, the more am I tempted to account the Epistle to the Hebrews as his masterpiece. It bears the seal of perfection, just as those to the Thessalonians denote the commencement of his career as an author." (*Ib.* section 143.)

The Greek cannot be from S. Paul's hand. Are we to say that it is a translation from a Hebrew original? Clement of Alexandria thought that it was; but Origen had sound reasons for abandoning his master's opinion. We venture to think that it is almost as evident that the Greek is no translation, as that the Greek is not S. Paul's own. Much stress has generally been laid on the apparent use of the Septuagint by the original author; but, although this argument is not without weight, it is yet by no means so conclusive as many have wished to consider it. It is argued that the very point of difference between the Hebrew and the Septuagint enters more than once into the argument itself, so that to abandon the reading is to destroy the reasoning. If this were accurately true, it would be almost conclusive as to the language in which the Epistle was written; for it is not likely that the writer would desert the original Hebrew and conform to the LXX., if he were writing the letter in Hebrew.

But, on examining the passages adduced as examples (especially x. 5—10 and 38, 39), it will be found that, though the LXX. reading seems to improve the force of the passage, it is yet by no means essential to the logical inference. A proof, however, which by itself does not suffice, may often help to build up a conclusive argument; and if the manner in which the quotations from the LXX. are handled in this Epistle does not absolutely prove that the original language was Greek, it is at least a valuable confirmation of other proofs, which are not wanting.

Many of the peculiarities of style which make this Epistle so unlike the other thirteen of S. Paul, seem also to declare that it is no translation. The Greek is too elegant, the rounding of the periods is too graceful; the flow of the sentences is too natural to suggest to any mind that it is a reproduction from a widely

* An Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament, by Dr. John Leonard Hug. Translated by the Rev. Daniel Guildford Wait, LL.D. London. 1827.

different idiom. Then, again, there are many long compound words which exactly suit the genius of the Greek, and seem to be the direct exponents of original compound thoughts, but which we can hardly bring ourselves to regard as ingenious condensations of much longer and more unwieldy expressions in the original. Some of these beautiful inventions of a mind deeply Grecian in its literary habits could not be rendered in any other language without heart-rending circumlocution; and if that other language were the stiff and uncompromising, though strong and beautiful, Hebrew, in which, for mere want of adjectives, very simple ideas often require to be eked out with a combination of substantives, we may be allowed to believe that the task of retranslation would have been too severe for even holy David's unassisted powers. If the Epistle be indeed a translation from Hebrew into Greek, it is one in which the translator has had large license to modify and invent; and if the limits of what is meant by translation be indefinitely stretched till they admit the freest paraphrase of the thoughts of another, then Clement of Alexandria's opinion may be explained away till it coincides with Origen's.

But now, if the Greek of this Epistle is neither a translation in any strict sense of the word, nor the writing of S. Paul, we must admit one of two things—either that S. Paul was not the author or that it is possible to effect a divorce between the author and the writer. If we take the latter course, we have Cornelius a Lapide against us.

Some (he says), including Origen and Clement of Alexandria,* quoted above, make answer that it was written in Greek, after such a manner that the ideas and the subject matter belong to Paul, but the wording and the composition to S. Luke, or to Clement, and that for this reason it is more elegant than the other epistles of Paul. In this case, however, Paul would not be the author and sacred writer of this epistle, but much rather Luke, or Clement, the man, in fact, who wrote down and put in order the various ideas, not by his own caprice, but by the inspiration of God, and under the dictation of the Holy Ghost.

A Lapide in this remark forgets himself. To say that the actual writer, the framer of the words and sentences, has the best right to be considered the author, is to make the raiment more than the body, or the body more than the soul. When we pass from the words, and the syntax, and the flow of language, to the examination of the thoughts and the arguments, and the treatment of the subject, we find S. Paul and the spirit of S. Paul living and moving in every verse. There is only one Paul, in his

* This is a slip of the pen. Indeed, A Lapide contradicts it in the very next paragraph.

intense individuality, in the Church of God ; but there must needs have been two Pauls if any other than the Doctor of the Gentiles conceived the Epistle to the Hebrews. Either S. Paul or his "alter ego" gave existence to the letter ; but that "alter ego" never trod this earth.

Difficulties seem to hem our subject round. If we are to go by first appearances, and to form our judgment from externals, we shall say that the Epistle to the Hebrews is from any other hand than S. Paul's ; but, whilst we are thus avoiding one difficulty, and shrinking in despair from the attempt to reconcile discordant language and divergent style, we find that we are only entangling ourselves more inextricably still in the meshes of a more unmanageable net. S. Paul did not think in the same groove as other men : and to read a letter which is made up of his thoughts, all arranged after his own way of thinking, and deny his authorship, is something like denying the Creator in His own creation, only because His name is not written in gold upon the azure sky.

At the Robber-Council of Ephesus the Eutychians cried out in their gentle and conciliatory way : Who cleaveth Christ, cleave him in twain ! Cursed be he that severeth !* They were lamentably wrong in their notions of what was and what was not divisible ; but he who divides what is really indivisible deserves the anathema of sensible men. Therefore we will not divide S. Paul from himself as long as there is an alternative left us.

We are free to assert that the Greek as we have it is the original text ; that it is not from the hand of S. Paul, nor yet a translation from the Hebrew of S. Paul ; and that for all that S. Paul is verily the author of the Epistle. With all deference to A Lapide, his judgment must be set aside in this matter. Without diving into the lowest depths of the doctrine of inspiration, or committing ourselves to any theory, it is enough to know that the Church by no means insists upon strict verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture, but lends her entire approval to theologians who uphold the "formal inspiration," accompanied by the "material assistance," of the Holy Ghost : who maintain, in other words, that the substance of what is said is Divine, but that the manner of saying it is left to the discretion of the inspired writer. He must be preserved from the possibility of error in the thing revealed, but he is free to adopt these words or those, this form of sentence or that, one figure of speech or another, even Anacoluthon included. The gift of inspiration does not necessarily involve high literary excellence ; and, indeed, if it did, it could not stop short of the very highest perfection ; and not only should we find, as now, a beauti-

* τὸν λέγοντα δύο φύσεις εἰς δύο τέμνει. ἀνάθεμα τῷ διαιροῦντι. (Labbe, t. 4, pp. 917, 918.)

ful admixture of sublime and simple, but the more we scrutinized each word and phrase, the more we should discover that the matchless beauty of the whole was due to the faultless, though varied, beauty of each several part, and there would certainly be no room for the modest excuses which close the Second Book of Machabees: "Which if I have done well, and as it becometh the history, it is what I desired: but if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned me."

If, then, S. Paul, either for want of leisure time, or simply because he wished to present his ideas clothed in more classic Greek, had taken one of his companions, a man deeply imbued with Christian doctrine, familiar with the Apostle's habit of mind, and train of thought, and method of reasoning, and had deputed him to draw up a little treatise in his most telling Greek, sketching out the kind of thing wanted, the divisions of the subject, the run of the argument, the various proofs, the plan of attack and defence, the tone of the address, the mode of blending all together, the arrangement and proportion of exhortation and instruction, the transition from dogmatic principles to practical application, with other items of detail; and if, after the skilful amanuensis had reduced these spoken hints into written Greek (*ὥσπερ εἰ σχολιογραφήσας τὰ εἰρημένα τοῦ διδασκάλου*), S. Paul carefully examined the work, revised and corrected it, retrenching, or expanding, or improving when he met anything that was not exactly what his inspiration recognized as its own legitimate expression, and if, after assuring himself that it was a faithful embodiment of what he had in his own mind, he formally adopted and endorsed it, and sent it out under the sanction of his authority, who shall tell us that Barnabas, or Luke, or Silas, or Clement had a better right than Paul to be considered the author of that Epistle? S. Paul might have helped the writer in all the ways above specified, and the difficulty of supposing him to have taken so much trouble, and to have descended so scrupulously into detail, would be far less than the difficulties which have to be solved by those who say that S. Paul wrote the actual Greek, or by those who deny that S. Paul had anything at all to do with the letter.

Still, it is not necessary to suppose that S. Paul did quite everything that has been enumerated. He may have done considerably less, and still have been deservedly considered the author; for even so the matter is S. Paul's, the manner belongs to some one else. The words may be Luke's or Clement's, but the thoughts are the thoughts of Paul beyond the power of rhetoric to hide them. The soul is there and the body is there—it is but the garb which is changed.

This is the solution of the question given by Estius, and by Origen too, whatever Dean Alford may think. It seems complete and satisfactory, and reconciles the contending difficulties arising

from the contradictory character of the spirit and the letter in this Epistle to the Hebrews,—difficulties which seem incapable of simultaneous solution, because just in proportion as the one grows less the other gains importance, and to answer the one is to declare the other unanswerable. These difficulties now only do not vanish, because they have literally no existence. The language and the argument of the Epistle cease to be at variance the moment we are permitted to ascribe the one to S. Paul, without ascribing to him the other also. The Council of Trent tells us that S. Paul is the author. The author, in some true sense, S. Paul must be : this is, for us at least, out of the reach of dispute. We could not deny it if we wished ; but no argument has been yet put forward that need distantly tempt us to deny it ; and the deeper the insight we obtain by study into the inner meaning and spirit of the Epistle, the more our human judgment bears out the divinely assisted judgment of the Church, and forces upon us the conviction that S. Paul had the largest part in the production of the said Epistle. On the other hand, critics and scholars agree that the Greek is not S. Paul's, and is not a translation. There is one way out of the difficulty—easy, satisfactory, and orthodox—*τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ἐστίν.* “If I were to give my opinion,” says Origen once again, “I should say that the thoughts are the Apostle's, but that the wording and construction are the work of some one else.”

ART. IV.—MEMOIRS OF MADAME DE LAFAYETTE
AND MADAME DE MONTAGU.

Vie de Madame de Lafayette. Par Madame de LASTEYRIE, sa fille, et précédée d'une Notice sur la Mère Madame la Duchesse d'Ayen, 1737-1807. Paris : Léon Techener Fils.

Anne Paule Dominique de Noailles, Marquise de Montagu. Quatrième édition. Paris : Dentu.

A NOTICEABLE reaction in the way of sympathy has taken place within the last few years in France towards the elder branch of the Bourbons, and the faithful adherents who suffered for and with them in the terrible days of the First Revolution, a sympathy which is, we believe, unconnected with political hopes or plans, and which is felt by many who are content to

honour, as the powers that be, the representatives of the first Napoleon. It is said that the present Emperor in no way discourages it, and that he augurs no danger to his dynasty from the frequent appearance of the portraits of Marie Antoinette and her fair-haired boy, side by side with those of his Empress and the Prince Imperial. Be this as it may, and apart from all theories of legitimacy, it is a sign of grace and hope for France, that her eyes have so far recovered from the glare of revolutionary conflagration and military glory, as to look with pity and reverence, and perhaps with something of remorseful regret, upon the sufferings and the sufferers of those days of preternatural wickedness and of supernatural goodness.

Among the memoirs which have lately illustrated the period of the Revolution, the two works named at the head of this article have a special interest. The life of Madame de Lafayette, with a notice of her mother, the Duchess d'Ayen, is now published for the first time, though portions of the latter had already appeared in the beautiful memoir of Madame de Montagu. Taken together, the two volumes give us not only the portraits of three most remarkable and admirable women, but a life-like family group, which brings us at once into the centre of the old French society of the last century, which, with its good and its evil, was swept away for ever with the ancient monarchy of France. Almost all the members of the family of Noailles, one of the most illustrious among the court nobility, were, on the eve of the French Revolution, more or less affected by the fervour for liberty, and for the general reformation of abuses, which, to their credit, was as enthusiastically felt by the privileged classes, who had personally everything to lose, as by the *roturiers*, who had everything to gain by the change, and nothing (in Burke's words) to sacrifice but their shoe-buckles—* the obscure provincial advocates, country attorneys and notaries, by whom the *Tiers état* was chiefly represented in the assembly of the States General.

"It is not generally known," says the biographer of Madame de Montagu, "with what earnestness and good faith the nobility—and not only the provincial nobility, but even many of the magnates of the Court—had embraced the idea of a general reformation of the State, and hailed the approach of political liberty." This was proved by the part taken by the nobility in all the measures preparatory to the convocation of the States General. In the various documents then drawn up

* One of the harmless affectations of the early Republicans was to appear at court with shoe-strings instead of buckles. Hence :—

"Roland the just, with ribbons in his shoes."—*Anti-Jacobin*.

by them, we find the assertion of all the civil and political rights which the Republicans afterwards boasted to have wrested from them, and in a far fuller and more perfect form than that in which the Revolution left them after its career of horrors. They had, in fact, left little or nothing to the invention of modern Liberals. They had laid down all the great principles of representative government: a national representation by election; the equal division of taxes among all citizens; the fixed and periodical assemblage of the States General, to which, with the sanction of the king, was reserved the right of legislation; the responsibility of ministers; the liberty and security of individuals; the inviolability of property; liberty of commerce, labour, and industry; liberty of the press; the abolition of *lettres de cachet*: all these things, and much more in the same spirit, were claimed by the nobility and clergy no less than by the Tiers Etat.

If well employed, these elements would have sufficed to found a free government in France like that of England. . . . The Revolution wrecked this great reform, which would have been so easily effected under a king like Louis XVI.; its breath raised the tempest, the hand of the helmsman failed, and the vessel perished.

Unhappily, together with these enlightened and patriotic political views, too many of the higher as well as of the middle class had become deeply imbued with the *soi-disant* philosophy which Voltaire and other disciples of Bolingbroke had imported second-hand from England. The prevalent *Anglomania* was not only for round hats, high-trotting horses,* and constitutional governments, but for religious, or rather irreligious theories, which bore in reality as little resemblance to the then prevalent English Protestantism of Burke and George III. as the squalid *sans culottism* of Marat to the decent Whiggery of Somers.

The Count de Ségur† thus describes the opinions of the young French nobles, which he himself at the time shared:—

* "A courtier," says Sir Walter Scott, in his 'Life of Napoleon,' "deeply infected with the fashion of the time, was riding beside the king's carriage at a full trot, without observing that his horse's heels threw the mud into the royal vehicle. '*Vous me crottez, monsieur,*' said the king. The horseman, considering the words were *vous trottez*, and that the prince complimented his equestrian performance, answered, '*Oui, Sire, à l'Anglaise.*' The good-humoured monarch drew up the glass, and only said to the gentleman in the carriage, '*Voilà une Anglomanie bien forte.*' Alas! the unhappy prince lived to see the example of England, in her most dismal period, followed to a much more formidable extent.

† He married a younger sister of the Duchess d'Ayen.

Impeded in this light career by the antiquated pride of the old Court, the irksome etiquette of the old order of things, the severity of the old clergy, the aversion of our parents to our new fashions and our costumes, which were favourable to the principles of equality, we felt disposed to adopt with enthusiasm the philosophical doctrines professed by literary men, remarkable for their boldness and their wit. Voltaire seduced our imagination; Rousseau touched our hearts; we felt a secret pleasure in seeing that their attacks were directed against an old fabric, which presented to us a Gothic and ridiculous appearance. We were thus pleased at this petty war, although it was undermining our own rank and privileges and the remains of our ancient power; but we felt not these attacks personally, we merely witnessed them. It was as yet but a war of words and paper, which did not appear to us to threaten the superiority of existence we enjoyed, consolidated as we thought it by a possession of many centuries. . . . We were pleased with the courage of liberty, whatever language it assumed, and with the convenience of equality. There is a satisfaction in descending from a high rank, as long as the resumption of it is thought to be free and unobstructed; and regardless, therefore, of consequences, we enjoyed our patrician advantages, together with the sweets of plebeian philosophy.

It is evident, although rather implied than asserted by the dutiful children and grandchildren to whom we owe the memoirs before us, that the Duke d'Ayen, the head of the family of Noailles, had tasted of this poisoned chalice. He was an approved soldier and a brilliant man of the world, distinguished by a talent for conversation inherited from his grandfather, the old Maréchal de Noailles—science, literature, agriculture, philosophy, the business of the court and the camp, were alike familiar to him. He was, in fact, the very typical man of that gay and graceful French world of the eighteenth century, which was then fast drifting to so unlooked-for and tragical a conclusion. Like many others of his class, he possessed higher and nobler qualities than those which glittered on the surface. In inflexible truthfulness and integrity he was not surpassed even by his pious and scrupulously conscientious wife. "The idea," says Madame de Lafayette, "of regulating life by principles of duty, abstracting from all self-interest, had been rendered so habitual to us, not only by my mother's instructions, but by her daily and hourly example, as well as by that of my father on the occasions, unhappily too rare, when we were able to study it closely, that the first instances which we met with of an opposite conduct in those who are commonly called *honest people*, excited a surprise which it took many years passed in the world to weaken." Yet, though deeply attached to her husband, and although on great occasions he never failed to manifest his affection and esteem for her, Madame d'Ayen

could scarcely be accounted a happy wife. The Duke lived little at home. "Perhaps," says her daughter, "my mother, in her early youth, had suffered the superiority of her mind to appear too plainly to be pleasing to a young man." (She was two years older than the Duke, who had married at sixteen.) "Perhaps she had taken too little pains to please him; at least, she accused herself of having erred in this respect. It is certain that in the details of life she could never sufficiently overcome her natural indecision; and my father, attributing this to scrupulosity, took less pleasure in her society than would have been for his happiness and ours." This coldness on the part of her husband served, no doubt, to turn the full tide of her deep and strong affections upon her children, by whom it was devotedly and enthusiastically returned. "God had formed her before all things to be a mother." So wrote *Madame de Lafayette*, in the touching notice of her life, the writing of which beguiled the weary hours of captivity which she shared with her husband at Olmutz.* "We were," she continues, "the objects of the tenderest affection of her heart, and our training the first of her duties. To this lively impulse of the most motherly heart which God ever made, was joined the deeply-rooted intention to do the will of God, and to accomplish His work, so that she might be able one day to say to Him, after the example of our Lord,—'Of those whom Thou hast given to me I have lost none.' Everything was devoted to us; all her faculties were applied to our good and to our happiness; her solicitude and her foresight to turn aside everything which might injure us; her penetration to discern our characters, in order to direct each in the way most suited to it; the uprightness and strength of her mind to remove all frivolities from our education, and to accustom us, from our very childhood, to reason clearly and justly; her exceeding tenderness to cement our mutual union; and, lastly, her sweet eloquence, strengthened by her example, to teach us Christian virtue, with its principle, its aids, and its rewards."

The Duchess d'Ayen was the granddaughter of the celebrated Chancellor d'Aguesseau. Her mother having died a few days after her birth, she was sent at three years old to the Convent of the Visitation, at S. Denis, to be trained under the gentle yet firm discipline by which the daughters of S. Jane Frances de Chantal formed so many children of the nobility of France for a life of perfection, either in the world or in the cloister,—

* It was written with a toothpick and a morsel of Indian ink on the margin of a copy of Buffon; pen, ink, and paper, as well as knives and forks, being denied to the captives by the vigilance of the Austrian authorities,

a life which so many of her contemporaries consummated, like herself, on the scaffold.

From her earliest childhood (says Madame de Lafayette) my mother attached herself to the teaching of her holy instructresses with that uprightness and energy which were her distinctive characteristics, so that, with an uncertain, although superior mind, with a great physical and moral propensity to be disturbed and troubled under various circumstances, it was always manifest that this trouble and disquietude related only to the one object which pervaded her mind. "My heart," she might have said, "has never had any other fear than to offend against Thy law." Such, O my God, were the dispositions of my mother's heart, Thou didst form them within her, Thou hast crowned them, and that eternal justice which is none other than Thyself, now fills all the desires of her heart according to that promise of our Lord, "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after justice, for they shall be filled."

At fourteen Mademoiselle d'Aguesseau left the convent for her father's house, which was ordered with almost conventual regularity, and at eighteen she was married to the Duke d'Ayen, who became afterwards, by the death of the Maréchal, his father, Duke de Noailles. The death of her first child, a boy, was followed by the successive births of five daughters. A son, as it may be easily supposed, was earnestly desired, to wear and transmit the honours of this almost princely house. The boon was at last granted, which seemed to fill up the only void in its prosperity. But the mother's heart trembled at the dangers which must beset her frail treasure in the world, and with the heroism of a martyr, she offered him without reserve to God. On Holy Thursday, when she returned from praying at the Sepulchre, she said to a friend: "I have just killed my son, and I am a little afraid for my daughters. If any of my children should fall ill, I shall be very much afraid. I have offered them all to God, that He may restore them all to me for eternity. I hope, however, that He will leave me my girls; but I think that He has accepted my boy, and that I shall not keep him long." So deep was this impression, that when the child fell sick of a lingering illness, she never indulged a moment's hope. When he was in his agony, as she held him clasped tightly in her arms, she said to him, from the very depths of her mother's heart,—“You have gained the victory; my child, nothing can now part us or separate us for eternity.”

To the five daughters who remained, Madame d'Ayen devoted the remaining years of her life. Though they had other teachers, she herself superintended their education.

They came to her (says Madame de Montagu) the first thing in

the morning, met her when she was going to hear mass at the Jacobins or at S. Roch ; they dined with her at three o'clock, and afterwards she took them into her bedchamber. It was a great room, hung with crimson damask bordered with gold, with an immense bed. The duchess sat in her arm-chair near the fire, with her snuff-box, her books, and her needles close by her ; her five daughters grouped themselves around her, the elder ones on chairs, the little ones on stools, disputing lovingly which should get nearest to her. They talked of the lessons of yesterday and the little events of the day. It was not like a lesson, yet it was one, and a lesson better remembered than any other. . . . What eternal thanks are due from her daughters for having been brought by the prayers and instructions of such a mother to the happiness of knowing, serving, and loving God. "Non fecit taliter omni nationi."

There were peculiarities in Madame d'Ayen's mode of training which might have seemed of rather doubtful expediency, had they not been so fully justified by the result. She would point out to her children, as a warning, errors of judgment and mistakes in conduct into which she had herself fallen ; nor was she ever satisfied till she had convinced their reason as well as secured their obedience. She one day observed that, in consequence, they were far less docile than other children. "That may very well be, mamma," replied Madame de Lafayette, one of the most independent of the party, "because you allow us to make objections and to reason with you ; but you will see that at fifteen we shall be more, far more, docile than other girls." And so it came to pass ; for we find her, in the last quiet days which she enjoyed before the storm desolated the happy and stately home, surrounded by her daughters, their husbands and children—all, spite of the political differences which divided some of her sons-in-law, forming one harmonious circle, of which the hotel de Noailles was the centre. Her youngest daughter, Madame de Grammont, who perhaps resembled her most closely in the fervour of her piety and her singular unworldliness of spirit, and who was married to a husband like-minded with herself, resided with her at the hotel de Noailles. The fourth, Madame de Montagu, also singularly happy in the affection of her excellent husband and his family, was separated only by the distance of a street from her maternal home, of which she still continued to be the joy and the ornament. Madame de Thésan, the third, had nearly reached the close of her short and holy life. She was snatched away in the course of the year of which we are now writing, 1788. "Her second daughter (it is Madame de Lafayette herself who writes), whose troubles" (on account of her husband's absence in the American war) "had long been an anxiety to her, was now almost as happy a mother as she was a happy wife. . . . This second daughter,

whose fatiguing activity was often inconvenient, was also able to be of use to my mother in the many cares which devolved upon her." Lastly, "Madame de Noailles, her eldest daughter (married to her cousin, the Viscount de Noailles), notwithstanding her deep and tender attachment to her husband, was able to give my mother all the care and dutiful attention which made her the repose of that anxious spirit by the clearness and calmness of her own, and the joy of her life by the exceeding sensibility of her heart. She was the unfailing resource of all her family, by whom she was especially beloved."

The Viscount de Noailles fully participated in the political views of his celebrated brother-in-law and companion in arms, the Marquis de Lafayette, who was then in the zenith of his popularity, having brought back from his American campaigns military glory enough to intoxicate his fellow-countrymen, and republican enthusiasm enough to turn their heads and his own. "All," says M. de Ségur, in his memoirs, "who lived in those days still remember the enthusiasm excited by the return of M. de Lafayette, an enthusiasm in which the queen herself partook. A splendid fête was given to celebrate the birth of the heir to the throne. Information reached the palace of the arrival of the conqueror of Cornwallis, and Madame de Lafayette, who was present, received a very signal mark of royal favour, for the queen insisted on taking her in her own carriage to the hotel de Noailles, where her husband had just arrived." Such was the fervour then excited by him whom Carlyle describes as the "constitutional pedant, clear, thin, inflexible as water turned to thin ice, whom no queen's heart can love." His influence, and that of M. de Noailles, was great with their young brothers-in-law, with the exception of the Marquis de Montagu, the noblest character presented to us in these memoirs, who withstood to the utmost of his power the visionary theories of the one party, and the hot haste with which too many of the other left their country to its fate, in the vain hope of bringing it to reason by the edge of a foreign sword.

All, however, was yet at peace. "Never," says Madame de Staël, who filled a foremost place in it, "was any society at once so brilliant and so much in earnest as that of Paris, during the three years from 1788 to 1791." "The enthusiasm," says another eyewitness,* "went to the length of blindness; lively imaginations flattered themselves with the hope of seeing the finest chimeras realized, or deprived themselves joyfully of privileges which they considered abuses, thinking in their

* *Vie de la Princesse de Paix. Par la Vicomtesse de Noailles.*

simplicity thus to rise to a moral height which the masses would have the generosity to understand or respect. In short, like the astrologer in the fable, they fell into a well while gazing at the stars."

Madame d'Ayen was far from dreading any curtailment of the state and privileges of her rank: her love of poverty was more than republican, it was religious. Not a personal indulgence did she ever allow herself; all which was not strictly required by the duties of her position was devoted to the poor. Her first trouble in early life was the inheritance of her grandfather's large fortune. She ever looked upon riches, and the responsibility attending them, as a heavy and most unwelcome burden, and the only serious breach which she ever had with her husband related to the marriage of Madame de Lafayette, which she long opposed, simply on account of the great wealth and influential position of the proposed bridegroom, which she feared would prove dangerous to a youth of sixteen, left his own master at so early an age. But, without a shadow of selfish or class interest, she trembled at the storm which began to threaten all that she held dearest and most sacred, and to disturb even the harmony of her home circle. In the autumn of 1791, Madame d'Ayen saw for the last time her two daughters, Mesdames de Montagu and de Lafayette, at their country homes. After the king's acceptance of the constitution, M. de Lafayette resigned the command of the national guard, and retired, Cincinnatus-like, to his country house at Chavaniac (Haute-Loire), exceedingly well satisfied both with the constitution and himself. His wife was delighted, believing that, as he told her, the revolution was finished, and that they were to grow old together at Chavaniac, busied in rustic labours, with no other cares than those of the peasants around them. "I enjoy," wrote the *ci-devant* general to a friend, "as a lover of liberty and equality, the change which has placed all citizens on the same level, and which respects none but legal authorities. I cannot tell you with what delight I bow before a village mayor." His triumphal journey, impeded by popular ovations, led him through Auvergne, where Madame de Montagu was then lingering at Plauzat, a château of her father-in-law, M. de Beaune, making preparations to accompany her husband in his late and reluctant emigration to England. Madame de Lafayette wrote full of joy to her sister, to tell her that she and M. de Lafayette would stop at Plauzat, that they might rejoice together over the happy issue of public affairs. Madame de Montagu shed over this letter the bitter tears which we weep over the delusions of those we love. So far was the revolution from being at an end, that she trembled at the very idea of the

proposed visit. M. de Beaune was so ardent a royalist, and so highly incensed at the results of M. de Lafayette's political experiments, that he was likely, even in exile, to close his doors against her, should he hear that she had received him at Plauzat. Sadly, therefore, she wrote to her sister to appoint a meeting at a little wayside inn, where the two sisters bade a sad and hasty adieu to each other.

Madame d'Ayen soon afterwards arrived at Plauzat, where she spent a fortnight, long afterwards remembered by her daughter, who throughout the time never found courage to tell her of her approaching emigration. "It was then," says Madame de Lafayette, "that my sister received her last lessons and treasured up her last example, and my mother, when she parted from her, unconscious that it was on the threshold of eternity, carried with her the unspeakable consolation which she received from the sight of the gifts of God to her child."

From Plauzat Madame d'Ayen proceeded to Chavaniac, and thence to Paris.

Meanwhile the revolution pursued its course, and each fresh step brought new danger and anxiety to the family of Noailles. On the fearful 20th of June, the venerable Maréchal de Mouchy, the father of the Viscount de Noailles, remained all day at the side of the unhappy king, defending him with his body against the rabble, which had invaded his palace. The Duke d'Ayen, who had retired to Switzerland in disgust, returned to resume his office as captain of the body-guard, which, although abolished, was in his eyes re-created by the peril of the king. Though he had been strongly impressed with the ideas of 1789, he mourned bitterly over the excesses to which they had led, and, with his son-in-law, M. de Grammont, faithfully followed their unhappy sovereign until he sought ignominious shelter on the threshold of the Assembly. After all was over, he again sought refuge in Switzerland.

M. de Noailles was now a proscribed exile in England; M. de Lafayette a prisoner in Austria; Madame de Lafayette a captive on parole at Chavaniac; Madame d'Ayen, her eldest daughter, and her mother-in-law, the aged Maréchale de Noailles, remained in their hotel at Paris, where they were soon to fall a sacrifice to the bloodthirsty faction which was now master of France.

The Maréchal de Mouchy, the head of the younger branch of the family of Noailles, had been already detained five months in the Luxembourg, together with his wife, who had been born in that palace, in the room under that where she was now imprisoned, and had also left it a bride. In the April of 1794 the aged Maréchale de Noailles, now a widow, and partly imbecile

from age, the Duchess d'Ayen, and the Viscountess de Noailles, were removed thither. The acts of their martyrdom, for such it may well be called from the spirit in which it was endured, are thus given by M. Carrichon, their confessor, a priest of the Oratory :—

"I knew the Maréchale by sight, the two others well. I visited them once a week while they were still confined in their hotel. The terror was increasing with the crimes of the revolution, and the victims became daily more numerous. One day, when I was exhorting them to be prepared, I said to them, from a kind of presentiment : 'If you are sent to the guillotine, and God gives me strength, I will go with you.' They took me at my word, and said eagerly, 'You will promise.'? After a moment's hesitation I answered, 'Yes ; and that you may be sure to know me, I will wear a dark blue coat and a red waistcoat.' They often afterwards reminded me of my promise."

After their removal to the Luxembourg, M. Carrichon often heard of his penitents through M. Grellet, the tutor of Madame de Noailles's children, who contrived to keep up a communication with the prisoners, and used to take the little boys daily to a spot whence their mother could see them from a window of the prison.

"He often reminded me," says M. Carrichon, "of my promise, and on the 27th of June he came to beg me to render the same service to the Maréchal de Mouchy and his wife. I made my way into the court of the palace. I was long near them, and kept them in sight for a quarter of an hour, but M. and Madame de Mouchy, whom I had only seen once at their own house, and whom I knew better than they knew me, could not distinguish me. By the inspiration and help of God I did what I could for them. The Maréchal was singularly edifying, and was praying vocally with all his heart. He said, as he left the Luxembourg, to some who were showing sympathy for him, 'At seventeen I mounted the breach for my king, at seventy-seven I mount the scaffold for my God. My friends, I am not to be pitied.'"

One of the accusations brought against the Maréchal was, that he had sheltered priests, and that a *ci-devant* Christ had been found in his room.

"On the 22nd of July," continues M. Carrichon, "I was at home between eight and ten in the morning. I was just going out when I heard a knock at the door. On opening it, I saw M. Grellet and his two pupils, the children with the gaiety of their age, which overpowered their recent losses and the fear of those which were to come ; the tutor sad, pale, and pensive. 'Let us go into your study,' he said, 'and leave the children in this room.' As I shut the door he threw himself into a chair. 'It is all over, my friend,' he said ; 'those ladies are before the revolu-

tionary tribunal. I come to claim your promise. I am going to take the children to Vincennes to their little sister, and there I shall prepare them for this terrible blow.' Prepared as I had long been, I was terribly disturbed. At last I said, 'Leave me to change my dress, and pray to God to give me strength to fulfil my promise.' We found the poor children playing as merrily as possible. The sight and the thought of what they were about to hear, and of their meeting with their poor little sister, made my heart bleed. . . . I went to the palace between one and two. It was impossible to get in. . . . I returned about five o'clock, and, after another hour of tedious expectation, I saw by a movement in the crowd that the prison door was about to open. I placed myself close to the entrance; for the last fortnight it had been impossible to gain entrance into the court. The first cart was filled, and came towards me. It contained eight ladies of most edifying demeanour. Seven were unknown to me; the last, to whom I was very near, was the Maréchale de Noailles. I felt a momentary ray of hope when I saw her without her daughter-in-law and her granddaughter; but, alas! they immediately appeared in the second cart. Madame de Noailles was in white, which she had worn ever since the death of her father-in-law and mother-in-law, the Maréchal and Maréchale de Mouchy. She did not look more than four-and-twenty at the utmost. They had hardly taken their places when I saw the daughter show her mother all her wonted tender affection. I heard those around me say, 'Look at that young woman, how earnestly she is speaking to the other.' I seemed to hear what they were saying: 'Mama, he is not there;—look again;—I assure you, Mama, he is not there, nothing escapes me.' They forgot that I had told them it would be impossible for me to get into the court. The first cart remained close to me for at least a quarter of an hour. It passed on; the second came forward; I drew nearer; they did not see me. I turned back, went a long way round, and placed myself at the entrance of the Pont au Change in a conspicuous position. Madame de Noailles cast her eyes all around her. She passed on, and had not seen me. I followed them along the bridge, separated from them by the crowd, but still near them. Madame de Noailles still looked intently for me in vain. Madame d'Ayen's face bespoke visible anxiety. Her daughter redoubled her efforts without success. I was tempted to give it up. I said to myself, 'I have done what I could. The crowd will be the same everywhere; it will be impossible for me to see them.' I was about to withdraw, when the sky darkened, thunder was heard in the distance. I said to myself, 'I will try again.' By a short cut I arrived before the carts in the Rue S. Antoine, nearly opposite to the too celebrated prison of La Force. There a violent wind arose; the storm burst in its fury; flashes of lightning and claps of thunder rapidly succeeded each other; the rain fell in torrents. I took shelter under the door-way of a shop, which, to this day, I cannot look at without emotion. In one moment the street was swept: not a person was to be seen except in the door-ways, the shops, and at the windows. There was now no order in the procession. Those on horseback and on foot hastened their pace and the carts also. They came to the little S. Antoine, and I was still undecided. The first passed before me. By a hasty and

almost involuntary movement I left the shop and followed the other. I was alone with my penitents. Madame de Noailles caught sight of me, and her smile seemed to say : ' There you are at last, oh ! how thankful we are ; we have been long looking for you. Mama, there he is.' Madame d'Ayen revived. All my irresolution ceased. I felt by the grace of God filled with extraordinary courage. Bathed with sweat and rain, I continued to walk close by them. . . . The storm was at its height, the wind more and more impetuous. The poor old Maréchale de Noailles was terribly tormented by it ; her large cap was blown aside and exposed some of her grey hairs. She tottered on the miserable plank on which she was seated, her hands tied behind her back. She was insulted by the cries of some who were standing there, notwithstanding the rain. She bore it all with great patience. At last we came to the cross-way before the Faubourg S. Antoine. I went forward, looked all round, and said to myself : ' This is the best place to give them what they so earnestly desire.' The cart was going slower ; I turned towards them, making a sign to Madame de Noailles which she perfectly understood. ' Mama, M. Carrichon is going to give us absolution.' Then they bent their heads with an expression of penitence, contrition, hope, and piety. I raised my hand, and with my head covered, I pronounced the form of absolution, and then the words which follow it very distinctly and with supernatural attention. They united their intention more fervently than ever. I shall never forget that beautiful sight. From that moment the storm abated, the rain diminished, and seemed to have been sent only to render that solemn absolution possible. I blessed God for it, and they also. Their deportment betokened content, security, and joy. . . . At last we reached the fatal spot ; the scaffold was before us. The carts stopped, the guards surrounded them, and then a more numerous circle of spectators, the greater part laughing and amusing themselves at this horrible spectacle. I shuddered to be among them. While the executioner with two assistants was helping the ladies to descend from the first cart, Madame de Noailles was looking for me : she perceived me. How many things did she express to me by those animated, sweet, expressive eyes, now raised to heaven, now fixed upon me in a way which would have brought observation upon me if my neighbours had not been otherwise occupied. I drew my hat over my brow without losing sight of her. I seemed to understand all that she would say ; the expression of her countenance was so touching and so eloquent that the spectators said one to another : ' Oh ! how happy that young woman looks, how she raises her eyes to heaven, how she prays ; but what good will it do her ? '

" They now descended from the carts. I thanked God that I had not waited till that moment to give them the absolution ; we could not have united ourselves so tranquilly to give and receive this great grace as we had done on the way. I left my place, and came and faced the wooden staircase which led to the scaffold. The Maréchale de Noailles was opposite to me, in mourning for her husband. She was seated on a block of wood or stone, with her large eyes fixed. I had not forgotten to do for her what I had done for so many others. The rest were ranged in two lines on the side

opposite to the Faubourg S. Antoine. I looked for Madme d'Ayen and her daughter. I saw the mother in an attitude of devotion, simple, noble, resigned, and wholly absorbed in the sacrifice which she was about to make to God by the merits of His Divine Son, free from all disquietude; she looked, in short, as I used to see her when she had the happiness to receive Holy Communion. That sight I shall never forget; it is ineffaceable. I often seem to see her in that attitude. God grant that I may benefit by the recollection. The Maréchale de Noailles was the third to ascend the altar of sacrifice; six ladies followed. Madame d'Ayen was the tenth, well pleased, as it seemed to me, to die before her child. The executioner snatched off her cap. As it was fastened by a pin which he had not withdrawn, her hair was violently torn from her head, causing an expression of pain to appear on her features. The mother disappeared; her sweet and loving daughter took her place: when I looked upon her in her white dress, looking much younger than she was, like a gentle little lamb ready for the slaughter, I seemed to myself to be witnessing the martyrdom of one of the young virgins or holy women of the primitive Church. What happened to her mother happened also to her. There was the same momentary expression of pain, and then the same calmness, the same death. 'She is very happy,' cried I interiorly, when her body was thrown into that dreadful receptacle. Madame de Noailles, as well as her mother, had addressed some earnest exhortations to their companions in death, and among others to a young man who had uttered a fearful blasphemy in her hearing. As she was about to mount the bloody staircase leading to the scaffold, she turned her angelic countenance upon him and said, 'For God's love, Monsieur, say I forgive them.'"

Five years passed after this tragic day before the three surviving sisters met to spend a few weeks together in Holland. Before they parted they agreed to unite together every evening in spirit, and to say the following prayers composed by the three.

"The souls of the just are in the hand of God, and the torment of death shall not touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seem to die; and their departure is taken for misery, and their going away from us for utter destruction; but they are in peace, and though in the sight of men they suffered torments, their hope is full of immortality. O Lord, who hast made thy light and thy truth to shine upon them, to lead them to thy holy mountain and to make them enter into thy sanctuary, have mercy on us.

"O Lord, who hast been their support and their strength, have mercy on us.

"O Lord, who hast created them for Thy glory, protected them by Thy power, saved them by Thy mercy, have mercy on us.

"O Lord, who art now their refuge and their everlasting reward, have mercy on us.

"Be mindful of that mercy which Thou showest from generation to

generation on those that fear Thee. We beseech Thee, O Lord, save the children of Thine handmaid. In Thee, O my God, have they put their trust. Thou wilt not suffer us to be confounded for ever. We beseech Thee, O Lord, save the children of Thy handmaid.

“PRACTICE.

“Let us seek to enter into the same dispositions as these dear victims when preparing for death. In union with them let us meditate upon their happiness while we cease not to say with the Church, *requiem æternam dona eis Domine*.

“Let us hope to receive new benedictions for the fulfilment of the duties of our state, each according to her need. Let us beseech the Lord to increase in us His love, and to accomplish in us His will. Let us unite our prayers to those of the Church militant, of the Church suffering, but, still more, of the Church triumphant, by this perpetual canticle. Amen. Alleluia.

“As the disciple of Elias, when he saw him ascending to heaven, asked for a double portion of his spirit, let us ask their spirit, that we may be able to follow their footsteps upon earth. We have seen them weeping as they cast their seed upon the ground; one day we shall see them returning with joy, bearing their sheaves with them. Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia.

“Thou didst make them pass through fire and water to bring them to a place of refreshment. Alleluia.

“In Thee, O Lord, is the fountain of life, and in Thy light do they now see light. Alleluia.

“Thou hast been pleased to deliver them from all their troubles, that their eternal joy may be to sing Thy praise. Alleluia.

“As Azarias, Ananias, and Misael blessed the Lord in the furnace, so the three sisters now left in this vale of tears, desire to glorify Him in the midst of their sorrow.”

If Madame d'Ayen seemed fitted above all things to be a mother, Madame de Lafayette was above all things distinguished as a wife. Her devotion to the *icy pedant*, her husband, who was not, however, icy to her, nor, to do him justice, to his family or friends in general, surpassed even the ordinary love of woman. It not only nerved her to face danger and obloquy for him, and to share with him exile and captivity, but it unhappily verged upon such idolatry as should be paid by no Christian to any mortal being, and which is specially dangerous to a Christian wife wedded to an unbelieving husband. One thing, however, it left untouched—her faith as a Catholic Christian. She could adopt his political theories and use the republican shibboleths of the time, but the *citoyenne Lafayette* ever held fast to the faith of her childhood; nor could her attachment to her husband, or her regard for his popularity,

ever induce her to hear the mass of a constitutional priest, or in any way to hold communion *in sacris* with those who had rebelled against the authority of the Church. Nay, though she bore with their presence, as private individuals, at the general's table, she pointedly absented herself when the *assermenté* Bishop of Paris came to dine with him on his installation. No consideration could induce her to receive him as her diocesan. Her witty and free-thinking aunt, Madame de Tessé, said that her devotion was a *medley of the Catechism and the Declaration of Rights*. The unswerving integrity of Madame de Lafayette's faith, under circumstances so trying, is the more remarkable from the fact that, in her early girlhood, she had been so painfully beset by doubts, that her mother thought it expedient to defer her first communion, which was not made till after her marriage, at the age of sixteen. But though it left her faith intact, and never interfered with the conscientious discharge of all her religious obligations, it may be that it was the absorbing nature of her attachment to her husband which prevented her from attaining that high degree of interior perfection which so admirably characterized Madame de Montagu.

The details of Madame de Lafayette's last illness are touchingly given in a letter from her husband, written at the close of a union of thirty-four years. "She was fourteen and I was sixteen," he says, "when her heart first identified itself with all that affected me." Her illness, of more than a month's duration, was one long delirium, full of beautiful and pious fancies, pervaded by the master-passion of her life, never so freely and fully expressed before. "Had her mind," says M. de Lafayette, "been in its usual state, she would have thought it her duty to fix her thoughts upon *what she called her sins*, and to distract them from the sentiments which filled all the faculties of her soul." The details which he gives are deeply mournful, for it is clear that the sentiment which had constituted her earthly happiness, had ever been troubled by an under-current of deep anxiety for the soul in which her own was bound up. "Amid all her illusions," says her husband, "she only deceived herself with regard to me for a few moments, in which she persuaded herself that I had become a fervent Christian." It was but momentary, and accompanied by doubts and questions which proved that it was less an illusion than an intense desire.

"'Are you not a Christian?' she said to me one day, and as I made no answer—'Ah! I know what you are, you are a Fayettestiste.' 'You think I am very proud,' replied I, 'but are you not a little of the same opinion yourself?' 'Oh! yes,' cried she, 'with all my heart, I would give my life for that sect.'"

M. de Lafayette tells us that the delirium began after she had received, as he expresses it, *her sacraments*. How much of loneliness of heart, in the midst of the most intense earthly affection, does the following passage reveal :—

“Towards the close of her agony, and while she still retained the use of speech, my daughters feared that the habit of not occupying herself with objects of piety before me might be a restraint upon her saying or hearing prayers. A little crucifix was by her side, but, instead of taking it, she seized my hand, which she held between her own in the attitude of prayer. Probably she was praying for me. They asked me to leave her for a moment, in order that Madame de Montagu, who had always possessed her confidence on these subjects, might ask her if she had anything to say to her. My first impulse was to reject this request, tenderly and timidly as it was made. I feared that these last moments might be disturbed. I even acknowledge that my old conjugal affection for the first time experienced a feeling of jealousy. I felt a passionate desire to occupy her exclusively. I wanted all her looks, all her thoughts. But I overcame myself, wishing to leave her nothing to desire. I gave up my place to her sister, who repeated her question twice; but, though my wife loved her dearly and liked to have her near her, she twice answered ‘No,’ adding, ‘Go to supper,’ and seeming impatient that I should resume my place. As soon as I had done so, she once more put my hand between hers, saying, ‘I am all yours.’ These words—*toute à vous*—were the last which she uttered.”

He passes on to a heartfelt and well-deserved eulogium upon the noble conduct of this “falcon-hearted dove,” during the revolutionary troubles. “You know, as well as I do, all that she was, all that she did, during the Revolution.” It was little that, in the words of Charles Fox, she had flown to Olmutz on the wings of love and duty, to share her husband’s captivity. But he dwells specially upon her having remained in France, at her own exceeding personal risk, till she had satisfied all the claims of his creditors, and sent their son to America, to be brought up under the care of Washington; and on the “noble imprudence” which forbade her to conceal the name which had become so perilous to her. It appears that in those evil days many, even excellent and high-minded women, had brought themselves to pretend a fictitious divorce, in order to preserve the rights and property of their children; but every one of the energetic declarations and touching petitions which she addressed to the republican authorities began with these words, “Femme Lafayette.”

We trust that the husband so deeply loved and so more than duly honoured fulfilled one of her last injunctions imploring him to read, for the love of her, “certain books which assuredly,” he says, “I shall examine again with deep seriousness.”

In this recommendation, he adds, "she called her religion, to make it more acceptable to me, 'the sovereign liberty,' as she often quoted to me these words of the Abbé Fauchet—'Jesus Christ, my ONLY Master.'"

The memoir of Madame de Montagu* is marked by literary merit, independent of the interest of its principal subject, of the various remarkable characters by whom she was surrounded, and of the touching and striking incidents of her life. It combines, with its fervent piety, the sparkling animation peculiar to French biography. The romantic, mournful, and withal, at times, ludicrous scenes which diversify the history of the emigration, and the strangely contrasted characters which community of misfortune then often threw together, are sketched with a masterly touch. Among the victims involved in one common calamity there were those who suffered with meek fortitude as confessors for their faith, no less than as loyal subjects of their king; others, who had been contemptuously cast on foreign strands by the tempest which their own reckless folly had contributed to raise, and who sought to alleviate the weariness of exile by a melancholy imitation of the life of brilliant trifling and frigid philosophism which had formed the staple of Parisian society for the last half-century. With a household of the former class Madame de Montagu formed a close intimacy during the short period of her stay in England. It was the family of M. le Rebours, formerly president of the Parliament of Paris—a household marked by close family union and fervent piety, mingled with somewhat of the austerity which in those days was often an attendant of piety in France, even among those who were free from the errors of Jansenism. The family consisted of Madame le Rebours, her father and mother, and her six children, two girls already grown up—industrious, fervent, and recollected, and four fine boys, as modest and almost as shy as their sisters. M. de Barville, the grandfather, a venerable grey-haired magistrate, educated the elder ones; Madame de Barville daily catechized the younger. She was a tall, thin, somewhat severe-looking person, with eyes still full of animation, speaking little, but always sensibly, piously, and to the purpose. An aged exiled priest, named Durand, who had become the pastor of this little flock, said Mass daily in a large room set apart for the purpose. The whole family attended; among the servants were three good old men, who had grown gray in the president's service; the day was regularly closed at nine o'clock by a pious lecture and prayers, in which the king and his family were never forgotten. Madame

* The English translation just published is worthy of the original.

de Montagu never failed, if possible, to be present at these devotions. She was there on the day when the news of the king's murder reached Margate. The Abbé Durand, who was saying night prayers, stopped short at the place usually filled by the prayer for the king, and after a moment's silence he substituted for it a *De profundis*, begun in a broken voice and responded to by tears. But when the old priest would have passed on to the prayers which usually followed that which he had omitted, Madame de Barville, who was at the other end of the room, interrupted him by saying aloud: "We have not come to that yet, M. l'Abbé,—the prayer for the king." So well had those faithful hearts preserved in a foreign land the old French adage,—"Le roi est mort; vive le roi."

Madame de Montagu was no economist. In spite of her best endeavours, when she set to work to cut out garments, the woful waste of stuff showed her attempts at housewifery to be worse than useless. She laughed over her mishaps, but it was with tears in her eyes. England was too expensive a residence; and, after months of suffering and privation, she found shelter under the hospitable care of her aunt, the Countess de Tessé, one of the most remarkable women of her time.

Possessed of greater foresight than her brother, the Duke d'Ayen, Madame de Tessé had not left France "like a swallow carrying nothing with her but the plumage of her wings"; she had secured capital of some value, which she invested in land at Lowemberg, in the canton of Fribourg. It was a large farm, with plenty of pasturage for flocks. Here she and her husband (always subordinate to herself) lived at their ease, though without luxury, and were enabled to afford liberal hospitality to many of their friends and countrymen less well provided than themselves. Madame de Tessé was, alas! that most unlovely thing, an unbelieving woman; one of those intellectual ladies of the *old régime* who had been fascinated and led astray by the false philosophy of the age. She was a Liberal and a freethinker. In philosophy Voltaire, with whom she had been very intimate, was her master; in politics her nephew, M. de Lafayette, was her hero. Madame de Montagu had much to endure in her new home from the society into which she was thrown; but Madame de Tessé, notwithstanding her mental and spiritual aberrations, possessed a kindness and largeness of heart which endeared her to all her family. She was, moreover, happily extremely inconsistent in her speculative ideas. Professing and believing herself to be above all the prejudices of faith, she never failed to make a large sign of the cross behind her curtain whenever she took medicine. She loved not priests, but, by a happy inconsistency, she supported, on the produce of

her kitchen garden, three poor exiled priests who lived at Gormund; she would take Madame de Montagu to visit them, and, while she was deep in discussion with one, Madame de Montagu would quietly take another aside, and, kneeling down in a corner almost close to her aunt, who, notwithstanding her sharp eyes, saw nothing, she would make her confession at her ease.

Madame de Tessé had attracted to her solitude, in order to have some one to talk to after her own fashion, one of her old friends, the Marquis de Mun, formerly *beau cavalier*, and still *beau causeur*, *beau joueur*, full of wit, benevolence, and imperturbable *sang-froid*. His son, Adrian, an amiable and spirited young man, was of the party. We have already made acquaintance with him in the "*Récit d'une Sœur*," as the bereaved and heart-broken father, to whom his son, another Adrian, brought a sunbeam to cheer his home, and to herald the light of faith in his heart in the person of Eugénie de la Ferronnays. As for *M. le Comte de Tessé, grand d'Espagne de première classe, Chevalier des ordres, lieutenant-général des armées du Roi, premier écuyer de la feuë Reine, et naguère député du Maine aux Etats généraux*, he looked after the cultivation of the land, made various journeys when necessary, but figured little in the *salon*, and was, in fact, altogether eclipsed by his wife. The whole colony was afterwards removed from Switzerland to the shores of the Baltic. The same way of life was continued there; perpetual discussions, varied by the reading of romances. Madame de Montagu was doomed to listen in succession to the "*Chevaliers du Cygne*" of Madame de Genlis, then to "*Clarissa Harlowe*" for a whole mortal month; succeeded by "*Tristram Shandy*"; varied occasionally by a life from Plutarch, or an *oraison funèbre* from Bossuet. Bossuet and Plutarch were well enough, and even the romances better than the discussions which followed them. In her change of abode, however, Madame de Tessé had provided herself with (what she accounted a somewhat unnecessary luxury) a chaplain, the post being occupied by an exiled priest, named the Abbé de Luchet. His office was next to a sinecure; but, as she said with a smile to M. de Mun, "there is my niece to employ him." The Abbé de Luchet was awkward and absent, and it was long before Madame de Montagu could open her heart to him. But she found him at last to be a most worthy priest; not, perhaps, very capable of disentangling a sophistry, but very good to direct a simple, upright soul in the right way. She assisted daily at the old man's Mass, which he said in his attic, M. de Mun's valet, who served his Mass, being the only other worshipper. On Sundays two respectable emi-

grants of the neighbourhood increased the number of the congregation. But as Christmas drew near some of the country people, though living at a considerable distance, asked permission to come to the midnight Mass. At eleven o'clock, on a bitter cold Christmas-eve, the strangers knocked at the door. The attic was not yet prepared, and Madame de Montagu received them in the kitchen, where a great fire had been lighted. The party consisted of two or three families of peasants, very decently dressed. The women, like the men, wore thick leather gaiters, with the hair inside. The patriarch of the band, whose hair was white as snow, and his back bent with age, told Madame de Montagu that neither he nor his father or grandfather had ever had the happiness of hearing Mass at the hour of our Saviour's birth. He had come with his company many leagues across the marshes to adore the new-born Jesus in His crib, and to take part in a festival which had not perhaps been celebrated in that country since the Reformation. He belonged to the very scanty number of Catholic families which had never either apostatized or emigrated, and which, notwithstanding persecution and distance from all religious aid, had remained faithful to the religion of their fathers. While the old man told his tale, the women had gathered round the fire to dry their steaming garments, one of them reciting the rosary, while the others responded in a low voice. The men stood with their heads uncovered. The Abbé de Luchet's room would not hold all the congregation, so the door was left open, notwithstanding the cold, and some knelt on the steps of the staircase. Madame de Montagu often said that never had she heard a midnight mass sung at S. Roch, to the pealing organ and by the light of a thousand tapers, which touched her so deeply as this midnight celebration by a proscribed priest in an attic before that rustic audience. It seemed to carry her back to the midst of the shepherds in the stable of Bethlehem. Never, perhaps, had the Divine infant received homage more acceptable since S. Francis sang the Gospel at the midnight Mass in the cave at Greccio, when he instituted the touching devotion to the *Crib* which has since pervaded Christendom.

It was during her sojourn in Holstein that Madame de Montagu undertook her gigantic task, *L'Œuvre des Emigrés*. Devotion to the poor had ever formed one of the distinctive features of her lovely character. She shared it with all her sisters, but it seemed to be intensified in her, perhaps as a recompense for the acts of faith and humility by which, in the full tide of her greatness and prosperity, Madame d'Ayen had sought a pious beggar-woman to stand godmother for her little Pauline.

The poor whose sufferings now weighed upon her heart were of those on whom poverty falls hardest, from the softness and ease in which they have been nurtured. "When she saw those old soldiers and wandering priests, those magistrates without bread, those widows and young mothers scarcely able to find clothes for their children, so many respectable families in want of the mere necessities of life, the tears filled her eyes, and she felt almost ashamed of the security and abundance which she enjoyed with her aunt."

By dint of thinking and praying she came at last to the conviction that an appeal to public charity was the only possible means of affording effectual succour to all this misery. She at first thought of making a quête in Holstein; but her views gradually extended much farther. By inquiries as to the actual state of the emigrants, she discovered that there were at least forty thousand to support, and she set to work to beg by letter through every part of Europe. One of her most active assistants in this work of charity was the Count de Stolberg, then president of the Lutheran Consistory of the province. His wife, a Protestant like himself, was gentle, charitable, and pious. The intimacy thus established with Madame de Montagu led subsequently to the conversion of both. The work thus begun soon became universal; money flowed in to Madame de Montagu on all sides, but unhappily appeals for aid in still greater abundance; she was compelled to husband her resources. "My niece," Madame de Tessé would say laughingly, "gives everybody twelve sous less than they want to make them happy." But the twelve sous which she spared were for the daily bread of some other petitioner.

She was continually rummaging in her boxes and cupboards for something to sell or to give. She ended by making away with the black dress which she had worn in mourning for her mother, and which she treasured piously as a kind of relic; another time she sold her office-book. She gave everything,—her labour, her time, her sleep. The common distress touched her own family as well as others, but she scrupled to give them anything but the price of her own labour. One day Madame de Tessé, seeing her labouring hard to finish some embroidery, guessed that some one was waiting for the price of it, and gave her a gold box of the weight of six louis, bidding her give it to the emigrant whom she most desired to help. Madame de Montagu sent it at once to her father-in-law, M. de Beaune, for whom she had been labouring. It was in the month of January, 1798, and the old chief of the coalition of Auvergne had not wood to light his fire.

"You are out of place here, my dear niece," said Madame de

Tessé to her one day. "To do all you want to do, you ought to be either a *sœur grise* or the Empress of Russia."

Madame de Montagu ended a long life full of good works in 1839, on the 21st of January, the feast of S. Francis of Sales, to whom she had ever borne a special devotion, and to whose character of mingled sweetness and strength her own bore a marked resemblance. Her sweetness, like his, was, to use his own words, won at the sword's point, though the victory had been early won. The most lively remembrance of Madame de Montagu's early youth was that of her own *conversion*, which took place at twelve years old. Till that time she had been indocile, impetuous, and changeable, governed by outward impressions and altogether unmanageable; she would pass in one moment from violent anger to overflowing penitence, to fall back again the next moment into the very faults over which she had been weeping. With these natural dispositions she became, even before her first communion, gentle, patient, studious, and submitted not only to the common obligations of her state, but to severer rules which she traced out for herself. Her piety throughout life had a singularly attractive power even over those who had no sympathy with piety in general. Her aunt's philosophical friend, M. de Mun, used to say that Madame de Montagu was the only *dévôte* who ever gave him a desire to save his soul. With a heart singularly alive to the tenderest affections of kindred, she was subjected to the trial of surviving many whom she loved. In early life her two first children had been snatched from her in infancy.

At the death of the first her sorrow was so uncontrollable that her father-in-law took alarm, and stole away the picture of her baby from her. The next day he found her drawing it from memory; she was sitting, her eyes red with weeping, before the empty cradle, with the nurse by her side, whom she was painting also. M. de Beaune grew impatient with this indulgence of her grief, and, not to displease him, she ceased from that moment to speak of her child, and even went into society with him, thinking in her unselfish care for others that he needed the distraction; but the efforts which she made injured her health. The death of her second child was marked by a still more touching incident. After having watched the agony of her little girl the whole night through, as she was praying and weeping by her lifeless body, she was told that her sister, Madame de Grammont, who was then at the hotel de Noailles, had just given birth to her first child. This news, which at any other time would have been most joyful, at that moment could not have failed to increase her grief; but, to her husband's astonishment, she rose, dressed, asked if her eyes showed that she had been

crying, and told him that she was going to her sister. He tried in vain to dissuade her; she was afraid that the young and happy mother would be uneasy at her absence, and that some one would tell her the cause. She went therefore to the hotel de Noailles, saw the new-born baby in his cradle, embraced her sister with a calm and smiling countenance. She thought to return as she went, but her strength failed her; before she could reach her carriage, she fell fainting in an adjoining room.

The aged Duke de Noailles passed his last years under the care of his beloved daughter. In his last illness she ventured to speak to him more urgently upon religion than she had ever dared to do in her life before. He listened with visible emotion—received the last sacraments from the curé of Fontenay, and died peacefully in her arms. Attala de Montagu, who had been born during the exile of his family in Holstein, met with an accident when out hunting, the effects of which proved fatal. He died at the age of twenty-eight, giving most edifying marks of faith, courage, and resignation. M. de Montagu died the death of the just in January, 1834. His loss left a great void in the hearts of his wife and children; but they had no anxiety for his eternal happiness; he had not waited till the last hour to reconcile himself with God. M. de Lafayette closed a very different career a few months afterwards. Madame de Montagu survived her husband about five years, and then went peacefully to rest. Her children crowded around her at the first news of her illness; her face lighted up with joy when she heard their footsteps; she would fain not have grieved them even by her death, which she saw approaching, and yet she was joyful at the thought of rejoining those who had gone before her to heaven. She neither feared nor desired death, but asked her children to repeat with her—"Thy will be done." This had been her watchword throughout life; it was her passport in death. Mass was celebrated in her room; she followed the prayers in a kind of rapture, and her thanksgiving was interrupted only by the agony of death. A few hours afterwards she fell asleep in the Lord, in the seventy-third year of her age.

We strongly recommend any of our readers who may be still unacquainted with it, to possess themselves of this charming memoir of Madame de Montagu, which, in addition to its other claims on our attention, *se vend au profit des pauvres*,—for the benefit of the poor whom she so dearly loved,—and to whom, in the quaint phrase of her peasants at Fontenay, she was *pire qu'une mère*. Her labours in the *Œuvre des Emigrés*, and the sweet, loving, and hopeful spirit in which she worked, strongly remind us of another confessor of those days, the saintly Abbé

Carron. His memory is still blessed amongst us, and the works which he began here in his exile still abide. The chapel and schools of Somers' Town, and the convent of the "Faithful Companions of Jesus," bear witness to his labours of love. But of how many holy priests, cast by the reign of terror upon our shores, no record now remains. They came and went, they lived and laboured here in patience, poverty, and prayer. They received the alms and the hospitality of England; they lifted up holy hands for her before God, and more, far more, in their poor attics and lowly dwellings they offered up the Immaculate Lamb for the land once reeking with the blood of His saints. This, and the testimony of their pure and innocent lives, is all we know of them; but who shall say how large a debt we owe them for the revival of Catholicity in England, or how many, even individual conversions, may have indirectly followed from the melting away of the mists of prejudice before the gentle light of their example, and before the might of His Eucharistic presence, whom they brought once more amongst us—"who stood in the midst of us, and we knew Him not!"

Even apart from visible indications of extraordinary sanctity, the feeling inspired by the exiles in general was one of respectful sympathy. We have often heard that feeling expressed by the late Sir George Lee, the owner of Hartwell House, where Louis XVIII. and his little court passed the greater portion of their exile in England.

The old Elizabethan manor-house was crowded with inmates bearing the noblest names in France. Not an alcove or a summer-house sheltered beneath the stately cedars and chestnuts of the park but was turned into a dwelling-place, and yet, at the end of five years spent in a lonely village, in enforced idleness, by over a hundred persons, many of whom had been reared in luxury and self-indulgence, their benevolent and noble-hearted host could say, with tears in his eyes, that they had *left neither a scandal nor a debt behind them*. What they did leave behind them and what still lingers among the cottagers to this day, is the memory of the charity of Louis XVI.'s daughter to the poor.

ART. V.—DR. LEE ON ANGLICAN ORDERS.

The Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England. By the Rev.
F. G. LEE, D.C.L.

MANY a fortress has been preserved to its defenders by a show of merely apparent strength; and the besiegers have often struck their tents from before walls which needed hardly more than a trumpet-blast to rend them

From turret to foundation-stone,

and lay their pride in ruins. We all know the old stories of numberless camp-followers standing in arms before the messengers of the foe—the veriest shadow of strength; of ambassadors led through granaries where the wheat was thinly strewn over heaps of useless sand; of banquets where plenty seemed to reign while the givers fought against the pangs of hunger; every device by which weakness is made to appear as strength, and the hour of triumph or defeat delayed is familiar to us all. But in them all we find that the besieged had one point in their favour, which was often the element of their success, and that was the ignorance of their enemies as to their real condition. Their dire distress was not known; the weak points in their defences were not seen; the walls of their granaries spoke not of the hollow mockery of plenty which they showed. And we could not but feel, while reading Dr. Lee's book, that the fortress of Anglican Orders is not only not impregnable, but is not even safe. He has thrown down the gauntlet without, to all seeming, a thought of fear or mistrust; he has heaped page upon page of testimonies gathered from the four winds of heaven; and yet, despite it all, we cannot help the conviction coming over us that it is only show; the last effort of one who feels that his position is no longer tenable, if its real state should be known. He lacks the element which could bring success, want of knowledge on the part of those arrayed against him. We know all the weak points in his defences, we are prepared to see grains of reasoning strewn over barren sand; and knowing all this we admire his boldness, but we cannot congratulate him on his success.

The author has striven hard to make his *catena* of evidence in the case perfect;—link after link is laboured at with a perseverance worthy of a cause less desperate; and certainly from the preface to the Ordinal of Edward VI. down to Mr. De Lisle's evidence

of Sir Harry Trelawney's opinions in 1831, sufficient space is given for an exceeding great amount of industry. Into the details of each chapter we cannot enter, since their consideration would require a volume bulky as that of our author; but we hope by discussing the main points, historical and theological, of the controversy, to afford our readers ample proof of our assertion that the fortress of Anglican Orders is not defensible or safe. The canonical questions connected with it we purposely leave untouched, because the validity, which is all that Dr. Lee contends for, is not affected by them.

The first part of the book is taken up by a long series of extracts from various sources, consisting of the forms for ordination and consecration; and they are quoted as so many arguments in favour of the theory that the Anglican form is valid. How far they support this theory we shall see in the course of our examination. The groundwork of our argument shall be an extract from the book itself. At page 81 the author says: "Martene sums up what is essential for the ordination of a priest in the eighteenth section of the ninth article of his treatise—a conclusion which harmonizes completely with the principles which underlay the revised Ordinal of the English Church from the year 1549 to its final revision in 1662, and which equally characterizes it in its existing form. He thus states his decision—Cum igitur materia presbyteratus dici non possit traditio instrumentorum, nec consequenter forma verba illa solemnia, quæ tunc profert cum illa tradit episcopus; restat ut totam ejus essentiam in impositione manuum et orationibus, quæ consequenter recitantur, tertiâ præsertim prolata, quæ per modum præfationis cantatur, in antiquis Pontificalibus *Consecratio* dicta, constituamus. Hanc solam hæcenus agnoscunt omnes Orientales, hanc solam Patres antiqui, hanc solam Scriptura." Dr. Lee here accepts the decision of Dom Martene regarding the validity of matter and form; nay more, he professes from that decision to make his own case good. Now Martene says that "the whole essence" of the priesthood consists in "the imposition of hands and the prayers which are said after, especially the third long one, which is sung in the style of a preface, and called in the old Pontificals *The Consecration*." In these prayers the bishop expressly prays "super hos famulos tuos benedictionem Sancti Spiritus, et gratiæ sacerdotalis infunde virtutem"; and again, "Da, quæsumus, Omnipotens Pater, in hos famulos tuos Presbyterii dignitatem." From this we justly infer that in the form some words indicative of the order to be conferred should be expressed in order to render it valid. This conclusion is greatly strengthened by the very examples which Dr. Lee adduces; and we cannot help wondering at the state of mind which could induce him to believe that they tell for, instead of against himself. For

instance, in the form taken from the Apostolical Constitutions (p. 71) the Bishop prays thus, "Look down also now upon this Thy servant, elected by the consent of the whole clergy into the order of presbyters." At page 92 he confesses that in the Greek MS. quoted by Morinus, there is in the form "a prayer asking for special graces fitting and appropriate for each respective office." In the Oriental form (p. 101) the Bishop prays, "O God, who hast honoured with the title of priest those accounted worthy to discharge the holy ministry of the word of Thy Truth in this degree make Thy servant perfect, in all things well-pleasing unto Thee, and guiding well this great Priestly honour given unto him by Thy foreknowing power." Looking at all these testimonies drawn from such various sources, seeing (as a perusal of Dr. Lee's book shows) that in every case these prayers *are recited after* the imposition of hands, we can arrive at but one conclusion, that the expression in all these forms of the priestly office or its functions is without doubt a *sine quâ non* for the validity of the form of ordination. We have no intention of disputing the validity of priestly ordination in the Anglican Church on the ground of inadequate form; on the contrary, we confess that the form in the Ordinal of 1549 may be sufficient, though its terms are ambiguous; but the consideration of Martene's decision leads to the second part of our argument.

As in the ordination of priests, so in the consecration of bishops the matter and form consist in "*impositione manuum et orationibus quæ eam consequenter recitantur.*" This is proved, as in the former case, by an appeal to the forms of consecration quoted by Dr. Lee. We need not reproduce them; it is sufficient to say that in every one the episcopal order or functions is mentioned. But there is in these forms one curious coincidence which we cannot refuse ourselves the pleasure of noticing. Amongst his other forms Dr. Lee quotes one "most ancient" from the *Missale Francorum*, to which he gives the date 550. It is a beautiful prayer, and contains ample reference to the office of a bishop, as for instance "chosen to the ministry of the High-Priesthood"—"complete in the Priest the chief (summum) of Thy ministry"—"give unto him the episcopal chair," &c. This form is, almost word for word, the prayer which is recited (*quæ consequenter recitatur*) after the imposition of hands, and the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* in the Roman Pontifical of to-day. So that the form which Rome now uses has at least the antiquity of nearly 1400 years to recommend it; and we may learn how much reliance is to be placed on Dr. Lee's testimony when he tells us that in "the prayer which immediately follows these words (*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*) no mention is made of the episcopal function or dignity!" But we thank him nevertheless for the evidence he has adduced, and we realize once more the

truth "Fas est et ab hoste doceri." Comparing these forms, in each of which the office or dignity of bishop is designated, with that which Dr. Lee offers for our inspection in the Ordinal of 1549, we must confess a feeling of amazement at the supposition that there is anything in common between it and them. While in them everything is precise, every word weighed; in it we have a form as vague as words could make it; which would serve equally well for Confirmation as for Orders; and which, if it be sufficient, raises in our minds a doubt whether the Samaritans were not all bishops, since we read "they laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." We examine it word by word and line by line, only to rise from our deliberation convinced that it stands, like the Church to which it belongs, alone and isolated from the world. If we test it by the conditions which we find in the other forms we must declare it insufficient, null, and invalid. We say this in no spirit of triumph over Dr. Lee, it is simply the result of the evidence which he himself has placed before us, and which we have drawn out to its logical conclusions.

Before we turn to a consideration of the historical part of the work, we must turn aside for a few moments to study the new theology which we find laid down by Dr. Lee regarding Baptism and its effects. He opens Chapter XXI. with the theological axiom "Baptismus est janua Sacramentorum," and then after declaring its necessity, he goes on to say that actual baptism by water may be supplied in two ways, by desire or by martyrdom, as far as regards salvation. In this he is but declaring Catholic doctrine; but the conclusion which he ventures to deduce from this statement is so new that it deserves to be placed on record, if only to show what arguments men will dare to employ in a hopeless cause. Dr. Lee concludes (from the fact that baptism by desire is sufficient for salvation) that in the case "of persons who had never been validly baptized becoming bishops and consecrating others, it does not follow that their episcopal acts would be invalid. Because the baptism by desire is universally admitted to be sufficient for salvation when the baptism of water cannot be obtained, Dr. Lee says, "it seems to follow that he (who has only baptism by desire) is capable of receiving other sacraments, as ordination, though of course he would not be capable of receiving this validly had he knowingly neglected baptism, or should he neglect to supply the omission on becoming aware of it." We are told there is nothing new under the sun; but we venture to affirm that such a conclusion as this has been unknown hitherto to most people, if not to all. It might not be dangerous if it were recorded only as Dr. Lee's opinion; but he insinuates, if we rightly understand him, that his conclusion is endorsed, or, at least,

can be gathered from the ordinary teaching of Western Catholic doctors. Now, without one moment's hesitation, we declare that no Catholic could teach such a doctrine. Bellarmine, to whom Dr. Lee refers, and whom we choose as one of many, does not accept the conclusion; and we cannot help asking, did Dr. Lee read the whole chapter to which he refers, or did he read only so much as favoured his own opinion? For, after explaining in what baptism by desire supplies for baptism by water, Bellarmine gives his fourth proposition in these words:—"Martyrium, et Conversio ad Deum, licet Baptismata quædam sint; non sunt tamen Sacramenta." But for the reception of sacraments, it is necessary to pass through the gate of the sacraments, in other words, to receive sacramental baptism. If this be not true, then it must inevitably follow, from Dr. Lee's reasoning, that there can be a sacrament *without any matter or form*; which is manifestly absurd. The whole state of the question is so clearly put by Sardagna that we will quote the passage entire for the benefit of our readers; and that men may see how widely different is Dr. Lee's opinion from the teaching of the Catholic Church. "An baptismus sanguinis, seu martyrium suppleat in adultis virtutem baptismi aquæ? Resp: affirmative quoad effectum gratiæ, remissionem peccatorum, omnisque pænæ peccato debitæ tam temporalis quam æternæ; quoad alios autem effectus, baptismus aquæ supplere nequit; videlicet, quoad impressionem characteris, capacitatem proximam suscipiendi alia sacramenta, jus participandi bona Ecclesiæ, incorporationem cum Ecclesiâ, ac subjectionem potestati et jurisdictioni Ecclesiæ." Having drawn his own conclusion, Dr. Lee finishes his chapter on baptism by a "consolation" for his friends, that the supposition of unbaptized persons conferring orders frequently enough to break the apostolic succession is "an improbability so great as to be morally inconceivable." He speaks as if care in the administration of the Sacraments was the one thing of all others for which the English Church has been remarkable; as if there had been no time, of which Lingard speaks, when "it became necessary to establish for the moment a class of lay instructors, consisting of mechanics, licensed to read the service to the people in the church"; as if there had been no Commonwealth or reign of Puritanism; as if the Restoration had brought back with it times of apostolic purity and reverence, instead of deluging the kingdom with licentiousness, and forgetting even the very forms of religion; as if, in fine, the present position of what Dr. Lee would call the Catholic Church in England was not the development of our own days, but a natural inheritance handed down from father to son in every age, and in whose title-deeds no flaw or defect could by any means be traced. Would that, for the sake of the English Church, we could think so! but the whole

history of the times since the Reformation speaks too loudly to be doubted, and is too well-known to need repetition.

Dr. Lee's "doctrine of intention," too, deserves a passing notice, if only to point out its sophisms. In matters of Common Law we might bow to his decisions; but we are compelled to dissent widely from his theological reasonings. He mingles things which ought to be kept separate, and draws conclusions from premisses which have no connection with each other, insomuch that we sometimes ask in wonder if he is attempting to mislead rather than guide the readers of his book. The chapter on Intention begins by stating fairly enough the various kinds of intention, and what kind is necessary for the administration of a sacrament; then the author proceeds to apologize for the Reformation Patriarchs by saying that, with regard to their consecrations and ordinations, "We may reasonably and properly assume that they acted in good faith, unless there exist direct reasons for an opposite conclusion." So far, good. "Now, in the cases of Barlow and Scory, it has been asserted that, owing to certain loose principles which were current at the period of Parker's consecration, and which, at one period, Barlow certainly, and Scory probably, shared, they could have had no such intention in conferring holy orders, as is needful to ensure the validity of the Sacramental Act." These "loose principles," were nothing less than a denial of sacramental orders, as instituted by our Lord; and, as "Barlow certainly, and Scory probably, shared" them, the natural inference would seem to be that there do exist direct reasons for concluding that they did not act in their ordinations in good faith, and therefore had no intention of conferring the sacrament. But Dr. Lee's mind is superior to the claims of logic, where his position has to be defended *coûte qui coûte*, and so he replies in this manner:—"To this it may be broadly answered" (we cannot help asking if "broadly" should be interpreted "wide of the mark?") "that the unworthiness of the minister hinders not the effect of the sacraments." The proposition is sound; the only difficulty in our mind is what has it to do with the subject. We are not considering the unworthiness of the minister but his intention; and we can see no parallel between the priest who says Mass in mortal sin, to quote S. Isidore's example, and Barlow conferring orders which he scorned and disbelieved. There is between the two the world-wide difference between faith and unbelief; and it is not moral guilt which would render Barlow's ordinations null; it is his want of intention to do what the Church does, which we assume, with reason, to be the natural sequence of his avowed disbelief in orders as a sacrament. His opinions on the subject, expressed at the Windsor Conference, are too well-known to admit of doubt, and therefore the onus lies on Dr. Lee to prove that those opinions were renounced or recalled. Instead of proof, he merely affirms

that "the requisite conditions were, in all probability, complied with both by Barlow and Scory in their public official acts." How he can reconcile this assertion with what follows, viz., "that they may have held erroneous opinions regarding the sacraments in general, and ordination in particular; they may have imperfectly comprehended, or inadequately accepted, the judgment of the teaching Church;" all this we do not profess to understand any more than we can understand how, as Dr. Lee maintains, Barlow could intend to do what Christ himself enjoined, and not intend to do what the Church enjoined, since the Church speaks as the mouthpiece of her Divine Master, and under the guidance of His Spirit. Yet, in spite of his own admissions, in spite of Barlow's known opinions on the subject of orders, and the absence of all proof that he ever recanted or recalled them, Dr. Lee can coolly sum up his chapter thus,—“It is concluded that an inadequate or imperfect belief on the part of one of God's ministers for ordaining, more especially if that inadequate belief (inadequate, by the way, means *insufficient for the purpose*) is the result of an intellectual misconception, or other unfortunate defect, does not invalidate the act of ordination, which in good faith and with a virtual intention is officially performed.” We have pointed out that both good faith and virtual intention were, presumably, wanting in Barlow's case; and that his argument, besides being false, is baseless in its foundation; but it would be a nice case, in these days of appeal and judgment, for the Privy Council to decide what amount of “imperfect belief,” or what “intellectual misconception” or other “unfortunate defect,” would render Dr. Tait incapable of conferring orders. We sadly fear that some “intellectual misconception or other unfortunate defect” was clouding Dr. Lee's mind when he penned this chapter on Intention, and that he is already sorrowing over the trite truth that “*littera scripta manet*.”

And now, with one parting remark, we will draw this portion of our notice to an end. In the “Comedy of Convocation,” Dean Primitive expresses the evangelical method of interpreting Scripture by a series of absurdly contradictory propositions—propositions which are almost too absurd to be considered possible. But if the “Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England” had been published before the Comedy, the Dean might have added Dr. Lee's testimony, when dealing with the Articles, as an instance not less absurd from the opposite side. For whereas Article XXV. declares in express terms, “Those five, commonly called Sacraments—that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction—are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel . . . for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God,” Dr. Lee, with all gravity, assures us that “Holy Orders, as the Church of England maintains, is

commonly called, and, it may be added, is rightly and properly called, a Sacrament." *Risum teneatis, amici!* Certainly, Dr. Lee is not happy in his logic or theology; let us see how he fares on the high road of history.

Our first investigation must regard the consecration of Barlow, since the foundation of the new hierarchy depends chiefly on the fact of his consecration. We have carefully examined and tested, as far as possible, all the evidence adduced in his favour; but it seems, to our mind, of no weight at all, since it depends on an assumption which Dr. Lee has not attempted to prove, viz., that Barlow was consecrated between April 21st and April 25th, 1535-36. His argument runs thus:—Barlow, being Bishop-elect of St. Asaph's, was elected Bishop of St. David's (he being at the time engaged on a political mission in Scotland) on April 10th, 1535-36; the royal assent was given April 20th, and Barlow was confirmed in person at Bow Church April 21st. *He must have been consecrated between April 21st and 25th*, for he obtained possession of the temporalities on April 25th. This evidence by itself deserves examination. In the first place, to accept it as true requires us to believe that the moment the election was declared, a messenger started with the news to Scotland, and that Barlow journeyed from Stirling Castle (not Edinburgh, as Dr. Lee says) to London, and that both journeys were accomplished in *ten days!* Such a travel (about 900 miles for the double journey) would be no wonder in our times of the iron horse; but considering the means and appliances of that age, it is well nigh impossible. It supposes a journey of ninety miles per day for ten successive days to render it even possible. When we consider the other circumstances, that Barlow was an ambassador, who would journey with his suite, and in great state; that there was no need for any great expedition on his part; that though the mandate for his confirmation exists, there is no word to hint even at consecration;—when all this is considered, the probabilities against the consecration become well nigh certainty. Haddon, the editor of Bramhall, saw this, and therefore admits that Barlow was not consecrated before June, and conjectures, indeed he says it is "almost certain," that the consecration took place on the same day as that of Repps to the see of Norwich, June 11th. Moreover, if the consecration occurred in April, how does it happen that Courayer, who was no lukewarm supporter of the cause, refers to a "mandate directed to Cranmer to consecrate him, dated the 24th June, 1536," and of which he offers no explanation? Finally, who is T. Meneven, mentioned in the two writs to Parliament during the time when Barlow is said to have held the see? Courayer had the wit to see how this, in an authentic document, told against his friends, and therefore wisely, we cannot say honestly, omitted all the initials. Dr. Lee, with

his usual ill-fortune, originates a theory of his own, and suggests that the scribe was deceived by the great resemblance which existed in that age between the letters T and G; and he even takes the trouble to quote in the appendix three examples from a MS. of the sixteenth century, in order to show the similarity. But, unfortunately for the theory, we find the bishops of that time called in the official documents not Gulielmus but Willielmus. For instance, Dr. Lee himself quotes the following testimonies to our assertion:— (1) in the commission dated 3rd February, 1548, for the translation of Barlow from St. David's to Bath and Wells, he is styled *several times* Will. Menev. Epis.; (2) the commission for the consecration of Robert Ferrar, Barlow's successor at St. David's, is "*Per translationem Willielmi*"; (3) the commission for the restoration of temporalities to Ferrar is "*Per translationem Willielmi*"; (4) in all the records quoted by Dr. Lee regarding the consecrations in question, there is only *one* instance of Gulielmi. This one is found in the record of Parker's consecration, kept at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; and its unique position almost tempts us to exclaim, that the exception does but serve to prove the rule.

The cumulative evidence which Dr. Lee heaps up is after all mere sound. The summons to Parliament, if urged at all, must tell against Barlow; for in the writs, both in 1536 and 1541, quoted by Rymer (vol. xiv.), the initial is T. Menev. The possession of temporalities, too, so far from proving Dr. Lee's position, tells in this instance terribly against him. For whereas in other cases consecration was required as a preliminary to possession, the grant to Barlow is an exceptional one, and runs as follows:— "*Cumque Præcentor et Capitulum prædictæ Cathedralis Ecclesiæ (Menevensis), post mortem prædicti Episcopi, licentiâ nostrâ prius obtentâ, dilectum et fidelem nostrum Willielmum Barlow, nunc dictæ Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Menevensis per nos nominatum Episcopum, in suum elegerunt Episcopum et pastorem, Reverendissimum in Christo Pater Thomas Cantuar. Archiep. electionem illam acceptaverit et confirmaverit; ipsumque sic electum Episcopum prædictæ Ecclesiæ Menev. præfecerit et Pastorem sicut per litteras patentes ipsius Archiep. inde directas nobis constat; nos nunc certis de causis et considerationibus nos specialiter moventibus, et ob sinceram dilectionem quam penes præfatum nunc Episcopum gerimus et habemus de gratiâ nostrâ speciali et ex certâ scientiâ et mero motu nostris dedimus et concessimus,*" &c. Here, contrary to usage and precedent, the king, for causes specially moving him thereto, grants the temporalities of St. David's to Barlow when the Archbishop of Canterbury had accepted and confirmed his election by the Præcentor and Chapter. There is no mention of consecration, and no sign by which we might gather that such a thing was either done or contemplated.

And with this knowledge of how he obtained the temporalities of his see, the difficulty of his taking his seat as a spiritual peer vanishes. It is true that, as Dr. Lee argues, consecration was requisite before a bishop could take his place among the peers ; yet this arose, not from the necessity of consecration, but from the fact that the temporalities, or the barony, were only given after consecration ; and the bishops sat, not because they were bishops, but because they were barons of the kingdom, and the barony followed consecration. In Barlow's case, unfortunately for the Anglican hierarchy, it followed election. In order to prove this, we must quote a protest issued by William Courteney, Archbishop of Canterbury, on behalf of himself and suffragans, in 1382, when, in a Parliament held at London, the peers condemned to death certain rebel nobles. It runs as follows :—" In Dei nomine, Amen. Cum de jure et consuetudine regni Angliæ ad Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem, qui pro tempore fuerit, nec non cæteros suos suffraganeos, confratres et coepiscopos, abbatesque et priores, aliosque Prælatos quoscunque, per baroniam nostro rege tenentes, pertineat in parliamentis regis quibuscunque, ut pares regni prædicti personaliter interesse," &c.* Here the Archbishop explains the right on which the spiritual peerage is based, viz., " per baroniam de nostro rege tenentes" ; and hence it is evident that any one possessing the temporalities of a see would be entitled to take his place as a peer. Whether he had been consecrated or not made no difference : consecration was usually a necessary antecedent ; but if the king chose to grant the temporalities after election and before consecration (as seems to have been done with Barlow), the lack of consecration would not prevent him from taking rank among the peers. From this, then, we can see why Barlow sat in Parliament, and how he became acknowledged as a legal bishop ; but, pace Dr. Lee, we cannot conclude that he was therefore consecrated. And so the secret is as impenetrable as ever. We may pass Barlow by, confident that few would be found to endorse Dr. Lee's opinion, " that ordinary judges of evidence would at once allow the existence of a moral certainty that William Barlow was duly consecrated a bishop."

As for Parker himself, Dr. Lee gives us no new information regarding him ; he simply tells what evidence there is in favour of his consecration, and omits to notice whatever has been adduced in opposition to it. How, for instance, does he reconcile with the Lambeth Register the commission in Rymer, dated Oct. 20, 1559, and signed " Per ipsam Reginam," empowering Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund, Bishop of London, and Richard, Bishop of Ely, to administer the oath of supremacy ? They could not have administered the oath unless they had been at that date

* Parker, "Lives of the Archbishops," p. 401.

recognized as bishops, since Dr. Lee, attempting to prove Barlow's consecration, says "until he had been solemnly consecrated he was not a bishop in the eye of the law." But if the three named in the commission were not bishops in the eye of the law, then they were not the persons designated in the commission, and therefore could not have executed it. It is not possible to suppose that the Government were so ignorant of the law as to nominate in a commission persons who had no power to execute it; to say nothing of Parker being styled "Archbishop of Canterbury" two months before his alleged consecration. Even Dr. Lingard could only explain it away by saying that it belongs to the second, not to the first year of Elizabeth's reign. We might overturn all history if we dealt with facts in this rude way; but fortunately for our purpose the commission itself bears internal evidence that it belongs to 1559: for one of the commissioners named in it with the so-styled archbishop was Dr. William May, and his death is mentioned in Le Neve's "*Fasti*," and by Strype, as having occurred on Aug. 8, 1560, or two months before the date of the commission. Again, Dr. Lee makes no attempt to explain how it was that when Elizabeth designed to seize the episcopal revenues the bishops attempted to dissuade her, and offered for her acceptance out of the revenues of their sees — Canterbury, £200; Ely, £200; London, £100; Hereford, 100 marks; and Chichester 100 marks. This offer, as we gather from Strype, could not have been made later than September, and the alleged consecrations of the Register are only said to have taken place in December; and yet here are men giving away portions of their revenues some time before their alleged consecration, though proof of consecration is required before they could be instituted into them. Nor again does he attempt to deal with the difficulty that the writs in Rymer empower Parker not only to confirm, but to *consecrate* Barlow and Scory, no less than Sandys or Davys. We say nothing at present (because it is a question which affects jurisdiction and not validity) of the absurdity of the position which makes Barlow confer jurisdiction on Parker, and which makes him also receive afterwards his own jurisdiction at the hands of the man he himself had consecrated! But until these and numerous other points have been cleared up it is useless to speak of Anglican consecrations with any degree even of probability.

The argument, also, which Dr. Lee attempts to found upon the "constant tradition" to the validity of his orders would have weight, we acknowledge, if such tradition had been handed down without contradiction; but it has been contradicted by every generation, and the "Nag's head fable," judged extrinsically, carries as much weight with it as the other side. Both have been affirmed, both have been strenuously denied; and the list of

Catholics and converts to the Catholic faith which Dr. Lee quotes in his favour has less weight still. They are like the bunches left by the gatherers in the vineyard—very few; and of them we venture to affirm that several disbelieved the validity of Anglican orders. We have consulted personal friends of Dr. Hendren, and they all declare that not only did he disbelieve their validity, but he spoke of them with a contempt akin to pity. Dr. Lingard goes no further than to affirm that Parker had *a* consecration; but he does not by that admission acknowledge that the consecration was valid; on the contrary, in Note K, Vol. VII., of his "*History of England*," he points out that the seven sacraments of the old Church have been curtailed to two by the new Church, which, as he expresses it, "was built on the ruins of the old." Archbishop Murray, too, whom Dr. Lee brings forward, held exactly the same opinion as Dr. Lingard, for when Dr. Doyle's letter on the union of the churches drew forth such marked attention, Dr. Sadleir, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, sought an interview with the archbishop, and expressed his willingness to see the reconciliation effected. "I fear it is not easy," said Dr. Murray, "we have seven sacraments, while you have only two." And, we doubt not, additional testimony might be adduced of others whom Dr. Lee assumes to have been or to be partisans of his cause; but did they all speak as strongly and as clearly as Dr. Lee could wish them to speak—the evidence as it stands is merely Dr. Lee's interpretation of what they said—we should still cry out "*Quid sunt inter tantos!*" Two or three for each generation, while the opponents of Anglican claims can be numbered by hundreds. If there is a thin chain of evidence in favour of the tradition, the chain of opposition is incomparably stronger. The whole Church has never for one instant hesitated in rejecting Anglican orders, and even the men who held Dr. Lee's opinion bowed to her decision.

We cannot conclude our notice without an acknowledgment that Dr. Lee's book will do good to those who read it with minds free from prejudice. While it fails completely, as we conceive, in proving the object he had at heart; it proves also completely another thing which Dr. Lee surely never contemplated when he compiled it; it proves that the Anglican Church is, at all events, in schism. The very evidence which he adduces to support his cause shows that the English Church withdrew from the jurisdiction of its lawful superior, the Bishop of Rome, without any adequate cause or right assigned; and that she thus rent the seamless robe of Christ. Her bishops therefore were consecrated (supposing them to have had a valid consecration) illicitly, and without any lawful approbation; for, as the author of Matthew Parker's life acknowledges, he, though he was the seventieth Bishop of Canterbury, was the first and only one who was consecrated "*sine*

bullata approbatione papali." The state of things which was thus inaugurated has been continued by their successors, the consecrations which were unlawful in the days of Elizabeth, are unlawful still, according to the axiom "nullum tempus occurrit Ecclesiæ." No length of time gives a privilege against her rights, and those unlawful consecrations must so remain till men seek once again the only fold, and make their submission to him who sits to-day in the See where his predecessor sat in the days of Henry and Elizabeth, and who claims their obedience in virtue of the succession derived from that one to whom it was said "to thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven."

ART. VI.—THE EDUCATION BILL.

1. *A Bill to provide for Public Elementary Education in England and Wales.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 17th February, 1870.
2. *Authorized Report of the great Meeting of the Friends of Religious Education, held in S. James's Hall, London, Friday, April 8th, 1870, under the Presidency of the Right Hon. the Earl of Shaftesbury, &c. Also a Report of a large Conference of Schoolmasters on the Education Bill, held in the Palace Hotel, Westminster, Saturday, April 9th, 1870.* Rev. W. STANYER, M.A., General Secretary, Manchester Buildings, 116, Cheetham Hill; and, City Buildings, Corporation Street. London Offices, 18, Parliament Street, S.W.
3. *Letters to my Constituents on Popular Education.* By HENRY S. P. WINTERBOTHAM, M.P. Reprinted from the *Stroud Journal*. Higgs, Journal Office, Stroud. 1869.
4. *Popular Education at Home and Abroad.* Burns, Oates, & Co.

THAT huge omnibus, the Irish Land Bill, has at length forced its way through Temple Bar, and the next in order is the Government Education Bill. In treating at all of a subject which has changed, and may still change its aspect week by week, we write under considerable disadvantages, compared with those of our contemporaries who reflect and discuss, day by day, the changing tone of public opinion. Still, national education is the question of the day. Its settlement, one way or another, can hardly fail to affect the national happiness and welfare for centuries to come; and there is no body of men whom it can so deeply interest as it does us Catholics. Even if we should have resolved to say nothing about it, it would, of necessity, be the chief subject of our thoughts.

In our last number we reviewed the state of the question, a

little later than the second reading of the Bill. Since that, the public at large has had little attention to spare to it; but there has not been a moment in which the growl of the thunder, though distant, has not been loud enough to make itself plainly heard by the attentive ear. The loudest objections to Mr. Foster's Bill have come from the supporters of secular education. They continue to demand that their system, their whole system, and nothing but their system, shall be accepted and enforced; that is, that rate-supported schools, free to all children, and giving secular education alone, shall immediately be established for all the children of the labouring classes throughout the land, and that all who cannot be proved to be receiving a competent education elsewhere, shall be compelled to attend them. This demand is so monstrous that it would not deserve serious attention, if those who consistently urge it were not, in fact, supported by many who fundamentally differ from them in principle. Those who really desire that the children of England should be brought up wholly without religion are comparatively a handful. They do not deserve even the dubious honour of being regarded as a religious sect. But let us class them as "secularists;" and they are, at the utmost, the very smallest of the multitudinous sects into which the English people are divided. And what they demand is nothing less than that all the children of all the working classes in England, whatever and however strong may be the religious convictions of their parents, shall be compelled by law to be educated in the peculiar and distinguishing views of their own minute sect; and that all the rate-payers in England, be their own religion what it may, shall be compelled to pay for that education. Such a demand, absurd as it would be in any case, would come with much more appearance of plausibility from the Quakers or the Plymouth Brothers, not to say the Baptists or the Wesleyans, than from the secularists, both because they are more numerous, and because their opinions and principles differ less fundamentally from those of the mass of their countrymen.

What makes this demand more strikingly ludicrous is, that it professes to be made in the name and interests of religious freedom. Of course, the principle assumed is that, with regard to education at least, religious freedom is purely negative; that it is a gross violation of it that any child should be taught any dogma which its parents do not believe, or that any ratepayer should contribute towards the expense of teaching what he does not believe; but no hardship at all, either to the parent that his child should be compelled to attend a school where he is taught everything else except his own religion, or to a ratepayer, that he should contribute towards such a negative education, even of the children of parents of his own religion.

We fear we must admit that those secularists who consciously and deliberately desire to get rid of all religion are few only by comparison. Canon Consitt stated, at the Newcastle meeting of the Education Union, that "one of the advocates of the League, one of the most determined, and, I may add, violent advocates in this town, did not hesitate to say publicly, that one reason why he wished to have secular education established in this country was because he felt it would be the upsetting and the end of all Christian teaching in the land." We fear he stands by no means alone. Yet he and those who sympathize with him would be by no means formidable if they were not supported by many who would much more willingly retain Christian teaching, and who only join in opposing it because they do not see how it is to be maintained without increasing the influence of the Anglican establishment, or at least without abandoning the hope of making use of national education as an instrument for its overthrow. The leader and type of this large party is Mr. Winterbotham, a barrister of ability, who has lately become member for Stroud, and who, as the representative of the political dissenters, has already attained in the House of Commons a degree of influence very unusual in so young a member. Mr. Winterbotham, we doubt not, is a religious man, and as such really desires that the youth of England should be religious. But he believes that denominational education, if it does not strengthen the Anglican communion, will prevent the new educational system from working to its disadvantage. His demands, therefore, hardly differ from those of the League. He says:—

I am met by a question with which I cannot help sympathizing. Why should we separate secular from religious education? Why should they not be blended as they are in the lessons of home? Why, indeed? There is but one answer. Men agree upon secular knowledge, and disagree upon religious truth (p. 33).

He is far too clear-headed to imagine, with many well-meaning men, that education can really be religious without being denominational. He therefore proposes that purely secular schools, supported by rates, should at once be provided for all children for whom sufficient means of education have not yet been provided, professing to continue on the present conditions the assistance now given from the Parliamentary grant to denominational schools. "Under this system," he says, "the denominational schools will 'still flourish,' if they continue to be supported by subscribers and parents as they are at present;" and "the secular schools will not empty or interfere with them unless (as I expect) they give a better education."

How large a proportion of Dissenters may be prepared to take Mr. Winterbotham as their leader, we cannot yet say. It is, how-

ever, already clear both that many of them do, and also that the demands of the secularists might safely be left out of practical consideration, if they were not thus supported by men who, in their hearts, prefer religious education, and only consent to give it up because they do not see how to secure it without losing an opportunity of weakening a rival body of religionists. Whenever we are met by any real danger to religion, it is always sure to result from religious divisions. If those who believe in Christ had been contented to remain in the Church He founded, they would have had nothing to fear from the opposition of others.

It is well worth notice that, although Mr. Foster's Bill demanded great sacrifices from the supporters of religious education, both in the Anglican Establishment and the Catholic Church, hardly any serious opposition to it has been made in either of those quarters. The loud opposition has been solely from the Secularists, and those Dissenters by whom they are supported. This is a strong and memorable testimony to the moderation of the other party, and to their sincere desire to see a system which shall offer the means of education to all children practically carried out. Another fact of much the same kind is that those who are so loudly protesting against any system of education which does not fully and entirely carry out their own notions, are men who have, in practice, done next to nothing for education, while the supporters of religious education, whom they wish absolutely to lay on the shelf, are the men who, for some forty years past, have been at work building schools by self-denying sacrifices and exertions, and labouring hard at teaching in them. But no sooner has Parliament expressed its purpose of establishing a national system of education, open to all the children of the land, than these Secularists, who have hitherto stood by idle, cry out, "Yes, by all means, only as to religion you must, of course, teach what we think right, and nothing else. We may be counted by tens, and those who fundamentally differ from us by millions, but we demand that they shall all give up all their wishes and views as to religious education, and that our own should be carried out whole and entire; upon this understanding and on the further understanding that we are not to be asked to subscribe a farthing towards the schools in which our views are to be taught, we are willing to give our high patronage to the scheme."

This seems absurd enough, but it must not be forgotten that when one party is loud in its demands and the opposite party nearly silent, the natural tendency of every popular Government is to make concessions to the noisy party at the cost of those who take things quietly. And hence we are far from surprised that all the concessions hitherto made by the Government have been in the direction not of religious but of secular education. The first

instalment of these concessions was contained in the amendments laid on the table by Mr. Foster just before the Whitsuntide holidays. The most important was that which, as we mentioned in our last number, had been promised by Mr. Gladstone in the debate on the second reading of the Bill—the adoption of what is called a “Time-table Conscience Clause,” instead of that which at first stood in the Bill. This it is said may be so worked as not to interfere with the religious teaching and practices of schools. In Protestant schools we have no doubt it may. In Catholic schools we are sure there will, to say the least, be great risk that any such alteration will interfere with the religious observances, which, after all, do more than anything else to give the school a Catholic atmosphere. At the same time we are bound to admit that, in drawing out the proposed “Time-table Conscience Clause,” Mr. Foster has done his utmost to unite the *maximum* of security against any child being taught anything to which its parents object, with the *minimum* of interference with the discipline and teaching of the school. He proposes that “the times during which any religious observance is practised, or instruction in religious subjects is given, at any meeting of the school, shall be either at the beginning or at the end, or at the beginning and the end of such meeting, and shall be inserted in a time-table to be approved by the Education Department, and to be kept permanently and conspicuously affixed in every school-room; and any scholar may be withdrawn by his parents from such observance or instruction without forfeiting any of the other benefits of the school.” No doubt this is intended to meet the obvious objection that if the children who do not attend the “instruction on religious subject,” were to spend the time allotted to it in play, a direct temptation would be held out to every idle child to torment its parents into withdrawing it. This of course may be prevented if the children who do not attend the religious teaching are set to some other lesson. But, so far as we see, there is nothing to prevent the “Time-table Conscience Clause” from interfering with the little religious observances, such as making the sign of the Cross and praying at the striking of the clock, which more than anything else give the school a Catholic character. There is therefore an evident danger, lest the clause now proposed should interfere with the religious teaching of the Catholic children, although intended only to protect any Protestant pupils. In this it differs seriously for the worse from the “Conscience Clause” originally proposed.

That this objection is not factiously urged by Catholics, is strikingly proved by the fact that before the alteration in the Act proposed by Government had been announced, it had been pointed out by the *Spectator*, a paper equally characterized by decided

Protestantism and by a most unusual degree of fairness in dealing with Catholics. It wrote (May, 7):—

We see no reason why the public specification of the times of formal religious teaching, and the clear separation of those times from the ordinary teaching, might not be conceded in both the new rate-founded and the old rate-aided schools alike; but that this will press very hardly on the Catholics, who profess to mingle religious worship most intimately with the ordinary teaching, and who would therefore be needlessly cut off from all aid from the rates—and logically before long also from the Privy Council—we say needlessly, because we believe that in practice Roman Catholic schools will hardly ever have a Protestant scholar in them to be protected, so that this provision will in fact simply operate to cut them off from help in prosecuting a most praiseworthy public object—the education of poor Roman Catholic children—without protecting any Protestant child's interest. Surely, if Roman Catholic schools in the Roman Catholic quarters of our great towns are well and ably taught to the satisfaction of the inspectors, and other, Protestant, schools are within reach for Protestant children, the former would deserve as much aid from the rates as the latter, in spite of their not separating the religious teaching so completely.

It is to be observed, that Mr. Foster's amendment goes beyond what the writer in the *Spectator* contemplated, and makes this "Time-table Clause" an indispensable condition, not only of aid from the rates to a denominational school, but for the continuance of any aid from the Parliamentary grant.

The next considerable concession promised by Mr. Foster was that, whereas the School Boards were to be appointed by the town council in a borough, and by the vestry in a parish, he now proposed that the appointment shall be made by the parishioners voting by ballot, and every ratepayer having an equal vote.

Lastly, whereas Mr. Foster originally proposed to enact that the Government inspectors should not examine the religious learning of the children except at the desire of the school managers, and with the consent of the Educational Department, the amendments made the prohibition absolute. This also is a concession to the Dissenters and Secularists, both of whom complained that if inspectors paid by the State were allowed, as has hitherto been the case, to test the religious knowledge of the children, that was a distinct payment by the State to religion, which, on their principles, is an abomination. Practically this amendment can affect only the schools of the Established Church, in which alone the inspectors have hitherto been allowed to examine the religious knowledge of the children. In Catholic schools and those of the dissenting bodies, the inspectors, although chosen from the same religious body, and more or less with its concurrence, have been strictly confined to secular subjects.

It seems to have been understood on both sides that the Government were ready favourably to consider other amendments in Committee, although these were all of any importance which they themselves proposed to make.

The amendments, of which notice has been given by different members, are nearly three hundred. It would therefore be almost impossible, as it is quite needless, to go through them all. Mr. Dixon, chairman of the League, has put on the paper notice of amendments, (1) to require that a "School Board" shall be elected in every school district; (2) to forbid the teaching of any "creed, catechism, or tenet peculiar to any sect" in any school provided by a School Board, allowing, however, that the Holy Scriptures may be read after, or before, school hours (no child being required to attend); and that the Board "may grant the use of the building for giving religious instruction out of school hours, provided that no preference is shown to any sect," but "may not grant it for religious worship," and also to require that such schools shall be free. With regard to the existing denominational schools, to which the Act as it stands enables the School Boards to grant aid out of the rates, provided that it is granted on equal terms to the schools of all denominations, he proposes to add the conditions that they shall henceforth be purely secular and absolutely free, and that the building shall never be used for religious worship—in a word, that these are in future not to differ in any respects from the schools to be provided by the Boards.

Mr. Vernon Harcourt proposes some amendments, the chief of which is, that the religious teaching in all schools established or aided by the rates shall be "undenominational and unsectarian."

Mr. Winterbotham proposes that the existing denominational schools may continue to receive aid from the Parliamentary Grant on condition of adopting the Time-table Conscience Clause, &c.; but that they are not to receive any assistance from the Education Rate except on condition of being changed into purely secular schools, such as he proposes to make the schools to be established by the School Boards.

With regard, therefore, to the proposed system of education, the struggle which is prominently going on has been, and is, between those who wish that it should be at least in the main "denominational," and those who are wishing to make it merely "secular," although among this last party there are many who desire, and perhaps expect, that religious teaching will still be given to the children, although not in the "National Schools" or during school hours. In writing for Catholics it is hardly necessary to prove that, even if it were so given, it would by no means meet the necessities of the case; but it may be worth while to say, that the expectation is utterly chimerical. The great

mass of the children for whose benefit a national system is now demanded are now utterly neglected and uncared for. Yet, there is certainly no one of them, at least in our great towns, who could not be sent to a day school, or, at the very least, to Sunday school, if its parents really cared about it. Why, then, are they not sent? Mr. Winterbotham himself answers:—"Partly, perhaps, owing to the poverty of the parents, but far more commonly to a selfish and criminal indifference on the part of the parent to the highest interest of the child."* Is it not plain, then, that, under a system such as he proposes, in which secular teaching is to be compulsory and religious education voluntary, all these children will be left utterly without it?

We have never had any fear that these extreme proposals will be carried in England, at least for years to come. What we have feared is some compromise which would be scarcely less fatal. The *Spectator*,† after examining Mr. Foster's concessions, says:—

If it were held sufficient to provide that the rate-provided schools shall in any case be (as regards religious teaching) whatever the majority really wish; and that all schools whatever receiving public aid, whether originally provided by public or private means, shall be fully available on all *other* subjects than religion, for those who do not like the religious teaching, we cannot imagine how such a design could be more perfectly and effectually worked out. We hold it, however, to be quite clear that this is not all that the country desires; nor, indeed, in our opinion, all that is intrinsically desirable.

The writer demands that in rate-built schools the use of any distinctive creed or formulary be absolutely prohibited, but that the teachers should be left at liberty to express "their own views as far as they find that essential to their efficiency as teachers." The effect of this, he thinks, will be that the masters will see "that the object of a religious lesson in a public school attended by the children of persons of all shades of opinion, should be to inculcate common principles as much as possible, and disputed opinions as little as possible—to avoid every sign of the triumph of one faith over another; to unite, not to divide." It adds, "we cannot therefore see anything but pure advantage in excluding from rate-built schools every distinctive formulary, and so warning the master, that though he is left free to express his own character and heart, this is not for the sake of any controversial purpose, but solely to avoid hampering him by rigid rules, incapable of satisfactory definition." The *Times*, June 16th, takes the same line. This view is natural; indeed, unavoidable when a man who really cares about religion at all sets himself seriously to frame a

* Speech at Stroud, June 8.

† May 28.

system of "public schools to be attended by the children of persons of all shades of opinion." If such schools must exist, it would probably be the least mischievous form into which they could be cast. For all religious men will feel, what the new Bishop of Exeter has very well and forcibly expressed, that by far the most important influence in education is "the atmosphere which surrounds an earnestly religious man." In fact, this is worth in itself far more than any formularies, or any rules requiring the reading of prayers in school. Who can doubt, for instance, that Dr. Arnold, although in many respects he held much less religious truth than the mass of head-masters for a century before his time, exerted a greater religious influence on his pupils than all of them put together, simply because there was a something about him which made it impossible for any one of them to doubt that he really loved and feared God and our Lord Jesus Christ. But it is certain that if the lips of teachers are to be closed upon all questions of real and vital moment ; if (to take one instance) a teacher who is asked by his pupil the question put by S. Philip to our Blessed Lord, namely, "How it is, now that He is gone into Heaven, that He manifests Himself to His own people, as He does not to the world," is bound, whether by a positive rule or by an honourable understanding, to answer, "You must not ask me about that ; I am not at liberty to tell you,"—the result will be that religious men will not undertake the office, and we shall have for our school teachers only the residuum—the men who are not fit for any other occupation, or who are willing to tell their pupils nothing bearing upon Almighty God, and the soul, because, in truth, they do not themselves care about such things. Thus, Lord Salisbury said,* "These men are for setting up a pagan system, to be enforced by pagan teachers." And when some of his audience met him with cries of "No, no," he continued,—“Yes, I say so, for this reason. There are people who are accustomed to refer their own motives and objects in life to a higher authority—to look to the supernatural, and to seek their reward beyond this world ; and, if they be true to themselves, they cannot try to influence others in any spirit but that which influences themselves. And if you call upon a teacher to influence those whom he teaches, upon the principle of a secular and pagan system entirely excluding religion, you will get none but men who do not care about religion."

This argument is so strong, and has been so much felt, even by the strongest advocates of secular education, that even Mr. Dixon said,† "The League had no wish to prevent teachers from making any incidental allusions to religion when a proper occasion might require it during the day."

* National Education Meeting, April 8.

† Schoolmasters' Conference, April 9.

And hence the compromise just now in fashion is to demand that national education shall be "religious, but unsectarian." This is the principle advocated by the *Times*, and however little we may think of the qualifications of the *Times* to judge of a religious question, there is no doubt that it has special means of knowing how public opinion is turning, and takes very good care how it commits itself to a cause not likely to win. On June 16th, the feast of Corpus Christi, it devoted a whole leading article to the question. It asks—

Is there no escape from the legitimate conclusion that schools supported from all sorts of creeds must teach no religion at all, and be as absolutely secular as the very small minority of "Secularists" pure and simple would desire?

Then it asks—

Putting the Secularists, and we suppose also the Roman Catholics, out of the question, cannot "all who profess and call themselves Christians" agree on some simple basis and first beginning of Christian knowledge for the poor children cast upon our common charity? Secularism, with lessons in religion from the clergy of different denominations, is what we must come to if the religious folks cannot hit upon a compromise which will do everything in the same rooms, and, as far as possible, with the same teachers.

What this proposal assumes as its first principle is, that the different religious sects whom it invites to unite are kept asunder, not by real differences of faith, not because one holds and the other denies doctrines, the knowing and believing which really affect the condition of man, but only by social and political quarrels and grievances, by scorn on one side and envy on the other. For no one could seriously invite religious men to sacrifice the teaching of doctrines which they believed it necessary for the children to learn. Unfortunately, we believe that what it assumes is substantially true. We say "unfortunately" because this tendency to amalgamation among our Protestant sects is one of the most deadly symptoms of mortal disease at their very heart. It is, in fact, the last symptom of a dying religion. The history of all heresies is that they begin with maintaining with enthusiastic earnestness and violence some dogma, generally in itself true, but perverted into heresy by being exaggerated and taken by itself, to the exclusion of other counterbalancing truths, side by side with which it stands in the Catholic Faith. For a while the new heretics are ready alike to slay or be slain for their distinguishing dogma. But when they have been formed into a sect, their fanaticism cools down little by little. They begin to doubt and qualify this doctrine and that, and having no authority to which to appeal, and no Divine Faith to retain unmutated, they become, in a few genera-

tions, indifferent to all religious truth, and at last even to the doctrine, whatever it was, for the sake of which they originally abandoned the Church. Look, for example, at the Lutherans. Their heresiarch abandoned the Catholic Faith for the sake of his own peculiar view of "justification by faith only." He founded a mighty sect, which still exists, indeed, separate from the Church, but divided from it, not by holding that peculiar dogma, but by rejecting all dogmas as such. Again, among those who abandoned the Catholic Faith for Luther's new doctrine, a mortal feud, as all the world knows, immediately sprang up. The two parties, Lutheran and Reformed, as they were called, were divided upon several vital points, specially on the doctrine of the Eucharist. It is certainly no exaggeration to say that Luther and the early Lutherans, much as they hated the doctrine of the Church, hated much more bitterly the teaching of Calvin and Zwingli. Yet King Frederick William III. of Prussia was able to unite the two into one sect, not because either of them had converted the other, but because both had really ceased to believe or care about any doctrine at all. Now, the Protestant sects of England once differed from each other most heartily. The Baptists, for instance, maintained that baptism was necessary, and that no baptism was valid except that given by immersion after the recipient had come to the age of reason. They therefore excluded from their communion, not only members of the other sects, but even such Baptists as, thinking this uncharitable, admitted them.* Now, so completely has doctrine died out, that Mr. Winterbotham, no bad judge, declares—

I would put it to any man who has heard as many sermons as I have, whether, if he went to a Baptist, a Presbyterian, an Independent, or a Wesleyan chapel, he could tell me, at the end of twelve months, to which sect it belonged.†

Of course this implies that both parties have ceased really to believe that Baptism, for instance, is of any real importance at all. The Baptist, if asked, would, we presume, say that the members of the other sects are unbaptised. He and they however really agree, because they all think that, whether a man is baptised or not, does not matter a straw. No great wonder, then, that the religious teaching they give their children is really and substantially the same. In most (we believe not all) Church of England schools

* The witty Rowland Hill was one day at a Baptist meeting, and when what Dissenters call "the ordinance" was about to be celebrated (*i.e.* the taking bread and wine), the "Deacon" came to him with evident reluctance, saying, "I am sorry, Mr. Hill, that you cannot sit down at our table." He replied, "Dear me, I beg your pardon; I was under a mistake. I thought it was the Lord's Table."

† Speech at Stroud.

the words of the "Church Catechism" are still taught as a routine task. There also are, we believe, some catechisms taught in most Dissenting schools; but the moment they get rid of the exact words of the formularies they are all agreed. The religion common to the mass of the Established Church (the Ritualists of course are an exception), to the Wesleyans, Independents, Baptists, &c., is, in few words, that the Bible is the Word of God; that the soul of man is immortal; that Christ is the Saviour of the world; that work or amusement on the Sabbath (meaning Sunday) is one of the greatest of sins; and that the Catholic Church is anti-Christ. We greatly doubt whether there is any other point of agreement. This is practically the religion taught in the mass of Church of England and Dissenting schools, and hence we maintain (as we did in our number for January) that the real difference between Church and Dissenting schools is not so much what is taught in them, as by whom it is taught; *i.e.*, the Church school brings its children under the influence of the clergyman and his family and Sunday-school teachers; the Dissenting school under the influence of the Dissenting minister and his deacons, &c. &c. We have since seen a curious confirmation of this in the report of Mr. Pryce, the inspector of Church of England schools in Mid-Wales.* He says:—

I am persuaded that in the majority of cases the clergyman would be satisfied if he were entrusted with the management of the school, and that he would take the same interest in it as he does at present, although the teaching were purely secular. The conviction has been forced upon me that the government of the school, and not the amount of religious instruction given, is what many of the Welsh clergy care most for.

The fact is, that in our day the distinction between the Established Church and the mass of the so-called orthodox Dissenters (*i.e.*, all except the Socinians) is not a religious but a social distinction, and there is nothing in which this is more felt than in the education question. The *Spectator* says the Dissenters' feeling—

Is wholly grounded upon a jealous sectarian view, apart from the interests of the children. It is a question of flags, not a question of conscience. "Their rates will in many cases go to support" a good school, with full protection indeed against any proselytism, but still a good school under the Church flag; whereas what they would desire would be to send their children to what they think an equally good or better school under a Dissenting flag, or, in a word, in such a case as we have supposed, they would pay what went to enhance the glory of the Church instead of the glory of Dissent.—(March 5.) Elsewhere it admits:—It was only right and just that the social arrogance and exclusiveness with which our national Church and its members have been

* Quoted by Mr. Winterbotham, Letters to Constituents, p. 38.

so frequently chargeable, should now recoil upon us and make the satisfactory settlement of one of the greatest questions of the day difficult to the point of extreme hazard. For the Church it is impossible to say anything except that it has been guilty of the social exclusiveness which is now causing so much soreness of feeling, although, day by day, that absurd caste feeling is dying away, and may, before very long, as we may well hope, be altogether extinct.—(March 19.)

In this state of feeling it is, so far as we can see, chiefly the fact of the Establishment which keeps the different Protestant sects from combining into one creedless body, or at least from mutually recognizing each other as equals, and whenever the Establishment question is set at rest, either by disendowment or by the entire abolition of tests and acts of uniformity, so that all sects may have an equal right to enjoy the endowments, we see no solid reason why the mass of English Protestants may not come to this mind. Meanwhile it is impossible not to see that the schoolmasters of the different sects, between whom this social distinction is much less strongly marked, have already arrived at it. On April 9th a conference took place "between a number of Liberal members of Parliament, who have taken a prominent part in the education discussion, and a large body of metropolitan school teachers belonging to the Church, British, and Wesleyan School Associations." One of the questions put to the teachers was, "Is it practicable to inculcate the moral precepts contained in the Bible used as a school-book, without making any reference to sectarian things, so that the school should remain utterly unsectarian"? Answers were given. All who spoke were of one mind, that there was no real difference between their teaching, and that the "religious difficulty" was merely imaginary. Mr. Lawson, secretary to the London Association of Church Teachers, said, "So far as Scripture lessons were concerned, there was little, if any, difference between the teaching in Church, Wesleyan, and British schools." "The teacher read a passage of Scripture, and explained it without intruding points of distinctive doctrine." Mr. Ryder, a British school teacher for nearly forty years, said that in his "Bible lesson the greatest care was taken that nothing should be sectarian. The Bible was not used to draw from it creeds and tenets peculiar to different denominations, but as a book whose lessons should fit the children to pass through life as good members of society, and also prepare them for that eternal world into which they must enter. He carefully abstained from any dogmatic theology, and was sure that the children themselves, or their parents, would be unable to say from his teaching to what denomination of Christians he himself belonged. . . . He felt sure that if this kind of Bible teaching were honestly and faithfully pursued in our schools, there would be no need of a conscience-clause at all. . . .

He had at one time nine per cent. of Roman Catholics, and twenty-nine per cent. of Church of England scholars, though this was professedly a Dissenting school. He had had children of infidels, one of whom was an infidel lecturer, who said he wished his two boys should be brought up in a knowledge of the Bible." Mr. Hellier, of the Church Schools, Lambeth, spoke in the same tone, saying, for instance, that "He believed all teachers, whether British, Church, or Wesleyan, thought more of Christian morality than of dogma." Upon this Mr. Dixon, M.P., asked what he meant by denominational teaching"? Mr. Hellier replied that "by Bible teaching he meant explaining the Bible, and dealing with those great truths which are the common ground on which all Christians stand; denominational teaching he understood to be, drawing out from the Bible, and making prominent that which supported or explained the dogmas of any denomination." We might give pages of extracts of the same character. What makes this more remarkable is, that these masters "unanimously" repudiated the idea that they could be satisfied with merely reading the Scriptures without explanation, which they declared "would be a farce," and rejected by a unanimous vote the proposal of a "Time-table Conscience-Clause." Mr. Grove, of All Souls' National School, Langham Place, said that if it meant "having a certain notified time for religious instruction, it was practicable, and had been carried out by himself and others in large and small schools; but it was generally understood that this conscience-clause meant also that the teacher's mouth would be shut upon religious topics, for the whole of the school hours, except that specified upon the time-table. . . . The great object should be to make religion permeate the whole life of a child, and become the mainspring of his actions; but this object would be unattained if the master were forbidden to open his mouth upon religious subjects during the greater part of the day. At the end of the meeting "The Right Hon. W. F. Cowper-Temple, who was not present at the commencement of the proceedings, asked those teachers who would be satisfied with the mere reading of the Bible without expounding it to hold up their hands. No one did so. But they unanimously replied in the affirmative [to the question] whether they would be satisfied with 'Bible teaching' as defined during the conference, avoiding doctrinal points."

A man who knows anything of the tone of schoolmasters in France or Germany must feel that there is much to rejoice and give thanks at in such a scene as this. We are fully convinced that these men say what they feel, when they declare that education must, before all things, be religious; and also that the mere reading of the Bible in the school would not be, in any sense, religious education, and not less so when they declare that it is

easy to give religious education "without teaching any dogma," and "avoiding all doctrinal points." Strange and paradoxical as the latter notion seems at first sight, it is by no means confined to schoolmasters. In fact, it is, just now, the popular, nay, almost universal feeling of religiously-minded laymen in England. Mr. Vernon Harcourt, himself son of a dignitary of the Church of England, and grandson of an archbishop, not only declared his own belief in it, but engaged to prove it to the House of Commons (debate, June 16th). The day on which he gave this remarkable pledge was the feast of Corpus Christi; it is impossible not to think how two schoolmasters, one Catholic, the other Protestant, could give "undenominational" instruction on religious subjects on such a day, that day avoiding all doctrinal points. Mr. Gladstone confined himself to saying, what was enough for his object, that he did not know how to define in an Act of Parliament what was and what was not "denominational" and "sectarian." But we have little doubt that the majority even of the House, and certainly the majority of the country, are in this matter with Mr. Vernon Harcourt and the schoolmasters, not with the Premier. A conviction so general among a practical people like the English must have some real meaning, however confusedly that meaning may be held and expressed.

And from this feeling it is that the Secularists derive their only real strength. The mass of those who stand by them would recoil with horror from what they really mean, viz., that children should be brought up with no religion at all. So much do they themselves feel this that, as a general rule, they confine themselves to vague terms, which do not express what they really want, protests against "denominational" or "sectarian" teaching, and the like; and we are confident that not one man in a hundred among those who attend their meetings, and vote,—nay, even speak in support of their resolutions, have, like Mr. Winterbotham, clearness of head and knowledge of the subject sufficient to know, that what this really means is the exclusion of all religious teaching altogether. The *Spectator* thinks that this fear of saying what they mean is the real cause of the exceptional bitterness shown by the Secularists at the present moment. They are in the annoying position of men who have put themselves so prominently forward that they must say what they want, and who yet dare not speak out. If they openly and decidedly demanded that no religion at all should be taught, they would at once lose all their followers. If they do not, their demands become inconsistent and unreal. And so, as we have seen, while pressing for merely secular education, even Mr. Dixon says that they "have no wish to prevent teachers from making any incidental allusions to religion." What takes place at most of the public meetings of this party is really amusing.

The resolutions are, for the most part, "cut and dried"; and, to do the gentlemen on the platform justice, they usually move and second them, each in his turn with a degree of regularity which shows how resolved they are to support their party. But listen to the speeches. Half of them, at least, are to say that education must and shall, before all things, be really religious; and to declare that such an education may be given without meddling with controversial subjects. That is all that they want. Mr. Winterbotham, to do him justice, sees very clearly what this really means. He said at the Stroud Meeting (at which the speeches were exactly of this character) "Our Chairman [Mr. Marling, M.P. for West Gloucestershire] says, 'Let us have undenominational teaching—such teaching as we can agree upon.' By all means; if we can agree upon religious education, have it. But how if we don't? Now, do we?" And then, answering the objection, that in the British schools such a system is actually adopted, he said, that those who support these schools are really only the Low Church party of the Established Church, the Baptists, Independents, Wesleyans, and other Methodists, but that it could not be stretched beyond them. If it were, the new wine would break the bottles. "The Unitarians have seceded from it. I do not think you could make it satisfactory to a consistent and logical Churchman. The Roman Catholics would have nothing to do with it. It comes, then, to this, that people who really do not differ at all would manage to sink their differences." This is the simple truth.

On the whole, then, we have watched, though not without anxiety, yet with thankfulness, the turn taken by this controversy. It has proved what we always believed, that although English Protestantism has so far entered upon its last stage, that the theological disputes by which it was originally divided already appear to most Protestants matters of no moment; they are still far from the state at which German, and we fear French, Protestantism long ago arrived, and to which they themselves are inevitably tending—a state in which everything that can be called religion has utterly died out. And this confirms a conviction at which we long ago arrived, and which we here desire to record. We are satisfied that whatever degree of success the Secularists may obtain in Parliament, whatever law may be passed (and we are far from denying the great danger of laws passing which may do great mischief), still, neither secular nor yet undenominational education will really and practically be carried out in England. How the working of the law will be evaded, through what gap the well-known coach-and-four will be driven, we do not undertake to predict. But, that some gap will be found, and that neither undenominational religious education, nor yet secular education will practically work in England, we are as sure as we can be of the

result of any conceivable experiment. This conviction is founded not on theory, but experience. The experiment has been tried ; for instance, in Prussia. If ever there was a country in which it was likely to succeed, that country was Prussia, because submission to a central authority, regulating by something like military discipline all the affairs of life, was never carried farther. The law and the administration long enacted that mixed schools should everywhere be worked. Yet although the schools were maintained at public cost, and although education was compulsory, it was found, first, that in practice very few of the schools were really mixed ; and next, that as far as they were so, the results had been in all respects bad. In so much that the attempt has now been given up, and although the law still allows a district to establish a mixed school, if such is the desire of the inhabitants, such schools are now never set up, and those which formerly existed are almost daily changed into denominational schools. Her Majesty's Commissioners reported last year—"a general conviction among all practical men, that the denominational school is the only school that is at present possible in Germany."*

In Holland and the United States secular (not undenominational) education is established by law, but it seems by the same report unlikely to be long maintained in operation. In Canada, although there is a system of secular education, it has already been found necessary to give the greatest facilities for the establishment of denominational schools, and they are rapidly spreading. In Ireland, where a system professedly mixed was established in 1832, it has never been carried out. So far as it has worked well it has worked by being made really and practically denominational ; so far as it is mixed it has worked so ill that the report delivered a few days ago by her Majesty's Commissioners, proposes that the attempt should be given up.

In a word, there is no one country in the world in which undenominational religious education has ever really worked, and

* Besides the valuable pamphlet, "Popular Education at Home and Abroad," which we have placed at the head of this article, we would specially refer our readers to a very valuable one published, we think, three years ago, by a Protestant gentleman who knows Prussia well, entitled "The Church of Rome under Protestant Governments," in which a very curious and instructive contrast is drawn, between the system adopted by the English Government in Ireland, and that adopted by the Prussian Government in its Catholic provinces. The difference, in one word, is this—the two Governments have proposed to themselves different objects. The object of the Prussian Government has been to make its Catholic subjects good, well-educated, and valuable citizens and soldiers. The object of the English Government has been, to adopt Archbishop Whately's expression, "to undermine the religion of the Irish." With these different objects in view it is not wonderful that very different means have been employed.

most assuredly if there is one people on earth among whom it is unlikely to work, it is the people of England, because there is none in which it is more opposed to the national habits, manners, and institutions, which are beyond anything else "denominational," and because there is none, among whom it is more hopeless to carry out by law any institution opposed to the popular sentiment. *Quid leges sine moribus* is indeed a maxim of universal appreciation. But if it had never applied anywhere else it would have been the characteristic of the English people. From all this we infer, without hesitation, that although at this moment the popular cry is for "religious but undenominational education," yet the vast majority of those who raise it really mean the first half of what they say, and do not at all understand the absurdity of the last half; and we think, in fact, as it has been well expressed, that "religious Protestants care much more for the truths which they believe than for the nonsense which they only talk;" and we feel confident that the national system to be set up in obedience to this demand, if it works at all, will very soon be found to work (more or less satisfactorily) as a denominational system of one sort or another.

And this brings us to the consideration of the additional changes which, while this article has been in progress, Mr. Gladstone has proposed in the Government Bill.

He began by declaring that the Government could not accede to Mr. Vernon Harcourt's proposal, that religious instruction should be given in the schools to be provided by the rates, but that nothing should be taught characteristic of any denomination. In order to carry out such a law he must settle what undenominational religious teaching is; and this could only be done, either by "constituting a new religious code, by Act of Parliament, by a process of excision and amputation," or else by conferring Papal authority upon the Educational Department. Of course he might have added that neither plan could by possibility work. He then stated what he considered to be the essential principles of the Bill. First, that the national revenue was to be applied only for secular results; next, that the machinery of voluntary schools should be employed as far "as it was available for our purpose;" thirdly, that the principle of rating should be adopted only "by way of supplementing the gap left by the voluntary schools." To manage this local School Boards, chosen by free popular election, were to be empowered to erect schools, either secular or "with such degrees of religious teaching as they might in their judgment find best suited to the wants of the particular district they happen to represent. They were also empowered to give aid from the rates to the voluntary schools of the district, subject only to the condition, that in order to check the action of undue religious prejudice, they

must give to all or none, and not make a selection between them." He did not propose to modify the principles of the measure. Upon the point of "local discretion," however, *i.e.* the large powers proposed to be given to the School Boards, his views "had not been altogether realized." Then after going through the different objections raised, he said that Government now proposed that in the schools to be founded by the Boards, their discretion should be thus far limited, that although they may still found purely secular schools, or schools in which any degree or kind of religion should be taught, it must be subjected to this limitation, *viz.*, that "no catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught." Next, with regard to the "voluntary schools," Mr. Gladstone saw that difficulties and inconveniences would arise in the working of the clause which enabled the School Boards to give to them aid from the rates, especially in consequence of "acrimony" with which the Roman Catholic schools would be regarded in the local boards. There would be danger of perpetual contests and frequent changes in the balance of opinion, in the Boards, by which assistance voted by one Board might be stopped by their successors. It seemed important, however, that there should be some prospect of permanence in the assistance thus granted,—permanence, that is, "not from generation to generation, but from year to year." To meet these difficulties, Mr. Gladstone proposed that the School Boards should have nothing to do with the voluntary schools, leaving them connected merely with the Educational Department of Government and dependent for public aid only on the Parliamentary Grant. But in doing this, "we must fulfil the engagements we have already entered into with the voluntary schools. We have held out, and I think, in every scheme of education that has been propounded, it has been held out, that in the competition with the rate-schools, they should receive some assistance towards lightening the burden of their expenditure." This he proposed to fulfil by increasing the allowance from the Parliamentary Grant. It must not however be so far increased as to infringe the principle of limiting it to secular results, *i.e.* aid given by Government to any voluntary school must fall short of what it would cost to maintain an equally good merely secular school. He proposes therefore to augment the grant to be given to schools (whether voluntary or founded by the rate), to a sum not to exceed one-half of the total cost. At the same time he proposes for the future not to make grants from the Privy Council towards the building, but only towards the annual expenses of schools.

Lastly, Mr. Gladstone threw out a hint that the year of grace, as it has been called, given to the friends of voluntary schools to supply the existing deficiency, after the amount of that deficiency

had been ascertained, might, perhaps, be curtailed. On this subject, however, he did not speak positively, and we cannot but hope that he will reconsider it. The curtailment of this year would be a most serious violation of his own "vital principle," that the deficiency is to be supplied, "if possible," by voluntary schools. In fact, there are the strongest possible reasons for extending it—say to two years or, at the very least, eighteen months.

Such, then, is the Government measure as it now stands. Supposing it to pass as it stands, its practical working (so far as it is given us to foresee what is future) would be first to stimulate the activity of those interested in education, by which we may reckon that a large proportion of the actual deficiency of schools will be supplied before the time comes (say eighteen months hence) at which School Boards can be called into operation. The School Boards, when constituted, will be required to supply the remainder. They will not have the power to apply any part of the rate in aid of the voluntary schools, which some men likely to guess right had been inclined to expect would have been their principal function if the Bill had passed in its original form. They will, therefore, be required to supply the deficiency (whatever it may be) by founding new schools. We do not see that the character of these schools is likely to be materially different from that which any schools founded by the School Boards under the original Bill would have had. The general feeling of the classes from which the Boards are likely to be taken is, at the present moment, so strongly in favour of religious but undenominational education, that we expect they will try to carry out that ideal. The mass of the new schools in that case will be, in theory, what the British Schools now are. In practice much will depend on the character of the masters appointed to them, and on the degree to which the clergy and other members of the Established Church are allowed and willing to take an active part in their administration and teaching. Dissenters are so numerous in the great towns that we incline to think they will preponderate on the School Boards; and if they do, we do not see why the mass of the new schools should not be exactly what the British Schools now are. At the same time, should the members of any School Board be out-and-out Church of England men, they may, without the least difficulty, make the new schools quite as decided Church of England schools as any of those now existing. The only limit to their power will be the rule which forbids the "Church Catechism" to be taught in the school. They may appoint what master they please; and he may, as often as he pleases, refer to, quote, and illustrate religious matters by reference to it and to the "Common Prayer Book." The Board, again, might most easily throw the whole of the social influence of the

school into the hands of the clergyman. On the whole, therefore, we see no reason why the schools to be provided out of the rate should not be very much what they would have been if the Bill had passed in its original shape; and as far as we can see, the great mass of them would, in that case, have been "British,"—a few, probably, "Church of England" schools.

Thus far, then, the change now proposed will be unfavourable to denominational education; for while the rate-founded schools will probably be much what they would have been without it, the encouragement which might have been expected from the aid given by the School Boards to voluntary schools will be cut off.

Against this, however, must be set the increased aid to be given by the Privy Council to voluntary schools. It has hitherto been calculated that, under the revised code, the annual cost of a school wholly satisfactory to the Government inspectors might be divided into three equal portions: one-third being met by the Government grant, one-third by the payments of the children, the remaining third by voluntary contributions. Of this last third, one half may now be granted by the Privy Council; so that the result will be that three-sixths (or half the total expense) will be paid by the Government grant, two-sixths (or one-third) by the children, and one-sixth by voluntary subscriptions. There is no doubt that this will be an important stimulus to voluntary schools; and Mr. Gladstone throughout assumed that it was to be extended to such voluntary schools as may hereafter be founded, as well as to those already existing when the School Board begins its operations. It is also to be remembered that as the voluntary schools will not be in any degree dependent on local taxation, while the schools supported by the Board will draw from the rates one-sixth of their annual expenses, as well as the whole cost of their erection, the natural tendency of the ratepayers will be to encourage voluntary schools, and in one way or another to get rid, as far as they can, of those connected with the School Boards.*

* The *Times* evidently pushes this a great deal too far. It says (June 18):—"When two systems run side by side, one must have the pull. Can it be doubted which of these two will outbid the other in the struggle for existence? The denominational school will appear under a double advantage. Half the cost of maintenance being refunded by the State, in addition to subscriptions, it can offer education at a *cheaper rate*, and it will be freed from the apparent odium of adding to the local rates." This article is written throughout in a spirit of hostility to denominational schools, which the writer declares "the voice of the nation rejects," and that "the agitation of the last two or three months has been one continual protest against the spread" of such schools. This is not surprising, as the *Times* has warmly advocated the figment of "undenominational religious schools," and naturally wishes to get rid of the denominational schools to make room for them. How little the writer attempted to be fair is proved by his saying,

On the whole we incline to think that the practical working of the Bill, if carried as it now stands, will be, that in the great towns, schools practically dissenting and not much different from those now called "British," will be set up to supply whatever deficiency may remain, say eighteen months hence, and that the Church of England and Catholic schools will be more numerous and more efficient than ever.

If, therefore, the Dissenters, who have lately made a loud cry for national education, really desire only that the means of obtaining secular education should be provided for all children, leaving all parents free to have their own children instructed in their own religion as they think best, we do not see how they can manage to find fault with the amended Bill. For, unless we are mistaken, its working will be, that in the great towns, where Dissenters are numerous, schools practically dissenting will be provided and maintained out of the rate, without any cost to the Dissenters; while Church of England and Catholic schools must be wholly provided by voluntary efforts, and when provided, must have recourse to them for one-sixth at least of their annual expenses. We do not see the fairness of this. But it is only an illustration of what often happens under our Parliamentary government, that a party loud in its complaints gets more than its fair share. Under such circumstances one can hardly wonder that the cry goes on even when there is nothing left to complain of, and, indeed, when the complainers have received much more than justice. This, we fear, may be the case in the present instance. The reception of the Bill in the House of Commons, on June 10th, was not encouraging. Mr. Dixon protested against any increased support to denominational schools, and Mr. Disraeli made an attack as clever as

the voluntary schools "can offer education at a cheaper rate," because "half the cost of their maintenance is to be refunded by the State, in addition to subscriptions," the proposal being that the State shall give the same to both classes of schools, but that those of the School Board are to make up the deficiency (always more than half the total cost) by rates, the others by voluntary subscriptions. Of course the rate of payment must be the same in both; and it will be the duty of the Educational Department to see that it is so, otherwise the Boards whose schools cost them nothing may very probably attempt to empty the voluntary schools by underselling them. It is specially provided in the Act (section 24) that the "Board may pay the whole or any part of the school fees payable by any child resident in their district whose parent is, in their opinion, unable from poverty to pay the same; but no such payment shall be made or refused on condition of the child attending any public school other than such as may be selected by the parent." This clause was evidently added expressly to prevent the School Board from bidding to attract the children of the poor from the voluntary schools. One can only hope it may not be evaded; and we must trust to the Education Department to prevent their using the power of "remitting payment" given by clause 17 to the same purpose.

usual, and, we should think, as ill-judged as any. He was bidding apparently for the support of the more extreme section of the Liberal party to aid him in overturning Mr. Gladstone's administration. But after the exposure of that policy, and of its effects upon the interests of the Conservatives, by Lord Salisbury, in the *Quarterly Review* last October, we incline to doubt whether he will obtain the support of his party in his attempt. A very short time will show. In reviewing what has hitherto passed we still think that Parliament, instead of leaving it to the School Boards to determine the religious character of the schools—a proposal with which no party has been satisfied (as Mr. Gladstone admits)—should have required that the report by which the amount of school deficiency is to be measured should also specify, as far as it can be ascertained, the religion professed by the parents of the children for whom schools are needed. And if the School Boards had then been required to provide, under the control of the Educational Department, schools of such religious character as would as far as possible meet the wants of the numbers thus ascertained. No one, of course, would wish that in an agricultural village containing, say, a hundred children of the Established Church, twenty Dissenters, and five Catholics, separate schools should be provided for each. These cases can only be met imperfectly; and we do not see how they could be better met than by a "conscience clause." But it is not with such cases that we have practically to do; the real case to be provided for is that of the crowded districts of our great towns. And in them there could be no real difficulty in ascertaining the number of children of each religion for whom schools had to be provided, nor yet in so placing the new schools as exactly to meet the deficiency. Such an arrangement would have been in exact keeping with the great principles of the Bill. For, so far as the action of the State is concerned, it would have provided that all the children hitherto neglected should receive good teaching in secular knowledge and in the religion of their parents. We do not, however, blame Mr. Gladstone for not proposing this, although no doubt the fairest plan. For the opposition it would have excited would have been so strong, that he could hardly hope to carry it. The mass of the Dissenters would have opposed to the death any measure which, as the *Spectator* expresses it, would have caused the children to be educated ever so well, if it had been "under the flag of the Established Church"; and Protestants in general would have opposed, even more violently, a measure the chief effect of which would have been to secure a good Catholic education to thousands of Catholic children. Sectarian bitterness would, as usual, have been too strong for the interests of the nation.

With regard to compulsion, upon which there has been so much

discussion, we think the Government proposal about the best that could have been made. The League has in nothing showed more clearly its ignorance of the English character than when it demanded immediate, direct, and universal compulsion. Nothing more effectual could have been devised to set the whole labouring class against education. "Permissive compulsion, as it is called, is proposed; that is, enabling the School Boards (with the consent of the Government, and subject to the *veto* of Parliament), to draw up rules such as they think it may be possible to enforce in the particular district. This is evidently only an experiment. We are inclined to think that thus cautiously introduced, it will be a great benefit. We should be glad to see an attempt made to apply the principle to country districts. Why should not an analogous power be vested in the magistrates where there is no School Board? No one who has had any practical experience can fail to know that to secure the regular attendance of the children who ought to be at school is often more difficult than to provide a good and efficient school.*

The election of the School Boards is, as Mr. Gladstone himself said in the House of Commons, the point upon which most difficulty has been felt. We adhere to an opinion expressed in our last number, and to which the *Times* has since acceded, that the only way of getting a fair School Board would be to adopt measures which would secure a very effective representation of minorities. If the districts in which School Boards are to be elected were considerably extended, and the number of members to be elected rather large; and if the election were then left in the hands of all ratepayers, each ratepayer having only one vote however large the number to be elected might be, this, we think, would give us a better Board than we shall get in any other way, and certainly far better than we should get by any system of election which merely represents the majority. The object is, to get a Board which shall be fair to all parties. Such a Board should contain men of every shade of opinion and every condition in life. Sober-minded

* The editor of *Catholic Opinion* says, June 4,—“The *Times* goes on to jeer at the notion of compulsory education. To us it seems that no scheme of education will be perfect without it. It may be differently applied in different districts, but there is a large number of parents whose cupidity, and many more, whose indolence will never be overcome by any other means. Some say compulsory education necessarily supposes undenominational education. We cannot see this. Let it be made compulsory that all children should go to some school. . . . Let parents be compelled to send their children, and to send them regularly, to some school, and let them make their choice. If Catholic parents, being compelled to send their children to some schools, do not send them to Catholic schools, they must be beyond the reach of Catholic influence; they must have lost the faith, and with such we have no means of dealing.”

men must, we think, agree that the great object in constituting a School Board is, to secure that it shall be as unlike as possible to our existing Boards of Guardians. Our best chance of getting a Board possessed of this invaluable qualification would seem to be by adopting the plan we have suggested. It would contain, as the *Times* says, "Ministers of religion of all denominations, churchwardens, deacons, landowners, farmers, manufacturers, tradesmen, artisans" [we would specially add ladies], "learning very much from each other, and effectually preventing the perversion of the schools under their control into mere seminaries of sects." In such a Board, no one interest would decidedly predominate, as it would be almost certain to do in one which merely represented the majority, whether of the ratepayers or of a town council. There would, therefore, be no great temptation to favour one sect to the injury of others; and when this is the case, the sense of justice, which is, after all, common among Englishmen when not carried away by party passion, would have fair play, and we may hope to see them do the best they can by all parties.

In reviewing the controversy of the last four months — the original proposals of Mr. Forster's Bill, and the changes introduced into it, first by himself, just before the Whitsuntide holidays, and since by Mr. Gladstone, we have hitherto considered it in the interests of all, both of the nation at large and of every section in it. But we cannot conclude without saying something on the peculiar position in which Catholics stand towards it. We heartily accept Mr. Gladstone's estimate of the essential principles of the Government measure. The great principle of all, namely, that education must be religious, we are sorry to say cannot be numbered among them, because the school boards were authorized, if they so pleased, to establish and maintain secular schools. But his essential principle was that the voluntary denominational schools were, as far as possible, to be used, and the principle of rating resorted to only so far as it was at last found indispensably necessary to the supply of a deficiency. His own words were:—

We found this system not only existing in this country, but overspreading it to an immense extent and on every ground, whether of that which is due to the promoters of those schools, to their benevolent and self-denying labours, and to the success which they have obtained, or whether on the ground of the purpose we have in view, and to its speedy, uniform, and economical attainment, we adopted this principle as one of vital importance that we would particularly endeavour to employ the machinery of the voluntary schools as far as it was available in aid of our object. But feeling that that large deficiency which is now observable in the country could not be made up by means of voluntary schools alone, we proposed to fall back on the principle of rating, and to make use of it by way of supplementing the gap which we saw before us (June 16th).

It is to be observed that Mr. Gladstone's "vital principles" are here in direct opposition to those of the League. The vital principles of the League are free secular schools everywhere, with compulsory attendance, and supported by rates. Whatever indulgence was shown to the voluntary schools was to be merely an indulgence, an exception from the operation of their own principle, conceded because the Government was admitted to be, to a certain extent, committed to them, but the object in view was to be their gradual absorption; and even Mr. Winterbotham, although on one point (that of the freedom of the schools) he differed from the League, still admitted that he expected and hoped that the voluntary schools would gradually be absorbed by secular schools established and maintained by rates. Mr. Gladstone's "vital principle" is, that the wants of the country are to be permanently supplied, as far as possible, by voluntary denominational schools, and that rating should only be adopted so far as these shall ultimately be found insufficient.

We have a right to demand at least that these principles should be fully and fairly carried out in dealing with Catholics. And this we are sure Mr. Gladstone will gladly concede to us if he can. Indeed, as a general principle, Catholics have more chance of fair play from men high in the administrative system than from those lower in the political and social scale. For this reason we wish to see the Educational Department invested with the greatest powers of control over the managers of every system of national education, because we believe that Catholics have more chance of obtaining justice from any administration than from Parliament, and more from any Parliament than from the local authorities, town councils, school boards, boards of guardians, &c. In dealing with Mr. Gladstone we have a double advantage; for not merely is he, from his position, raised above the low level of bigotry of men like Alderman Carter, but, although strongly anti-Catholic in his personal convictions, he has a strong sense of justice, in all respects worthy of an English statesman. It is avowedly on this ground that he wishes the denominational schools to be in relation rather with the Government than with the local school boards. His avowed object is "to escape from the evils attending [religious] controversies in the local boards in connection with voluntary schools, and at the same time do justice to these voluntary schools, and prevent that action of religious prejudice against particular, and possibly in some places obnoxious communions, which may give great cause of complaint." And what the "obnoxious communion" is, he tells us even more plainly. "The voluntary schools raise controversy, especially in connection with one portion of the community, whose case is the most difficult to deal with, whose case is also one which demands justice at our hands, and which

cannot be overlooked—I mean the case of the Roman Catholics.” Mr. Gladstone, therefore, recognizes not only that we have a right to equal justice, but also, what we all so keenly feel in practice, that from the local authorities we have, as things now stand, no chance of obtaining it.

Our real difficulty, we need hardly say, is, that in dealing with us, the objects and ends of most Protestants are quite different from those with which they deal with any other class of men. Upon this very subject of education, the great object we all have in view is to extend a more general civilization throughout all classes, and to raise its scale. In dealing with different Protestant sects, most men keep this before their eyes as the main object to be attained, and are anxious so to attain it as not needlessly to injure the interests of any religious body. With regard to us, experience shows us that the object is quite different. Archbishop Whately, for instance—a man, compared with most Protestants, liberal and large-hearted,—laboured for many years in a system of national education for Ireland, and at the end of his life avowed privately to his friend M. Senior, as all men now know, that the object he had had in view throughout had been “gradually to undermine” the religion of the people, and that he had been “obliged to fight the battle of the Education Board with one hand, and that his best, tied behind him, because he could not publicly defend it as an instrument of proselytism.” The knowledge of facts like these make it simply impossible for Catholics to proceed as they gladly would, upon the assumption that men whom they admit to be (like Archbishop Whately) honourable in their dealings with other classes of men are not trying to “undermine” their religion, even when they most loudly profess to be aiming only at the good of the nation at large. We appeal, then, to the justice of Mr. Gladstone, as to a man who, severed from us by a great gulf of theological differences, demands our confidence because he has already proved himself capable of doing justice even to those from whom he is most widely divided. His Bill (sect. 84) admits the principle that special cases are to be met by special additional grants. Now that our case is most special he has himself distinctly stated. He says that the portion of the nation for which we have to provide religious teaching is five per cent. of the whole ; adding, “I believe they assume that the proportion is higher. I take it at that. But that proportion by no means represents the share they ought to have in the operations of this Bill, because they are massed together in the great towns ; and probably a tenth, an eighth, or even a sixth of the educational destitution sought to be relieved is that of the children of Roman Catholic parents.” To this he might have added, that with this immense mass of the poorest of the poor to provide for, we are practically almost without any share of that middle class whose exceptional wealth is the

peculiar boast of England, and that of the upper ten thousand we have hardly a handful. The matter, therefore, stands thus. Mr. Gladstone's own vital principle is, that voluntary denominational schools should be the rule, rating the exception. But there is one religious body, and only one, utterly unable, however great and zealous may be its will, to provide schools for the secular teaching of a large class of its poor members. And that one body is the only body with whose principles schools such as those, the erection of which is contemplated by the present Act, especially as amended, are absolutely and vitally incompatible. We have, therefore, exceptional grounds for asking—we may say (as what we ask is a matter of justice not of favour) for demanding—special and exceptional assistance towards giving to the great masses of the poor of our own communion that secular education, which the State, for its own objects, has resolved that they ought to receive. No other religious body is placed in any circumstances resembling ours. The Church of England, for instance, may very easily, and by an exertion which its members will hardly feel, raise funds sufficient to provide schools to receive the children of all its professed members. If, therefore, its rulers believe that the rating schools, subject to the conditions now imposed upon them of not teaching the "Church Catechism," will be injurious to the religion of poor Church of England children educated in them, they have only to exert themselves, and, by the collection and expenditure of a fund like that collected by the late Bishop of London for providing additional churches in London, they may very easily provide for the education of all poor children of their communion. By the Wesleyans, the Independents, the Baptists, the same thing might be done without any extraordinary effort. Such a fund as was collected to celebrate Wesley's centenary would provide schools sufficient to receive all the Wesleyan children who need education. Moreover, it is now proposed that the schools to be provided by the rates should be regulated exactly on the principle of the "British Schools," which is that which these denominations have deliberately chosen for the education of their own children. To one body of Christians only in this country these remarks do not apply. The Roman Catholics have, on Mr. Gladstone's own showing, to provide religious teaching for "one-tenth, one-eighth, or one-sixth" of the class for whom education is now required (we believe for much more). The principle of the British schools is one utterly abhorrent to the whole principle of their religion; and moreover it is most certain that in no one single district of England will the proposed rating schools be made as little offensive to them as they can on principle be made, by having masters and managers of their own faith; while the Established Church, and still more the dissenters, may confidently reckon on

having them administered, in very many places, by men whose object it will be to train the children in the system professed respectively by them.

These considerations prove beyond all doubt that the Roman Catholic body in England has a most exceptional claim for government aid in providing secular teaching for the children for whom they are obliged to find religious education. But there are two others which make that claim far stronger. First, those who make it come into court not merely with clean hands, but with clear proofs that they have already done the State good service. The State itself regards the uneducated, untrained children of our gutter population as a most real and serious danger. It is to the exertions of the Roman Catholic body that it owes it that that danger is not much greater and more threatening than it is. Returns show that one-twentieth of the existing school provision in England has been made by their exertions; while all the schools provided by the dissenters of all classes in England, with all their zeal and with the possession of multitudes of wealthy men in the middle classes, is only two-twentieths. No one can fail to see, then, how much greater our exertions must have been to produce a result so nearly approaching to theirs. But this is not all. The conditions under which aid has been given from the Parliamentary grant towards the building of schools have all along been exceptionally unfavourable to us. As was shown in a letter which we published in our last number,* the rule that the grant must not exceed "the total amount voluntarily contributed by proprietors, residents, or employers of labour, in the parish where the school is situated, or within a radius of four miles from the school," was fair as applied to Anglicans and Dissenters, as giving an equitable test of the question whether the school was wanted. "But does it not sound like bitter mockery to the poor Priest, who has many hundred children to educate, with not a proprietor, not a resident *contributable*, not an employer of labour in the district prescribed, and who has to travel over England and Ireland to find contributors." This rule, measuring the assistance given by the State towards the provision of secular education for our poor children by the amount which can be raised on the spot towards it, has, of course, been a great hindrance to the provision of schools for the Catholic poor; but there have been other hindrances even more effectual. For nearly forty years aid has been given towards the erection of schools out of the Parliamentary grant. For very nearly half that time Catholics, and Catholics alone, were excluded, solely on account of their religion, from all share in the grant, towards the defraying of which,

* By Mr. T. W. Allies; see p. 435.

however, they had to pay their full share. Look, then, at the exertions of those by whom the existing schools in England have been provided, not in the fair and liberal light in which they were regarded by Mr. Gladstone in his late speech—as a great service rendered to the nation—but in a much lower point of view, as merely a race between the different religious bodies; and see the unfair terms under which Catholics, and Catholics alone, have had to run that race. All other religious communions have had some twenty years' start of us. It would, therefore, have been anything but wonderful if, in proportion to our numbers, our wealth, and the poor persons for whom we have had to provide education, we had now been found to have done far less than any other religious body in England. In fact, however, it will be found that in proportion to them, Catholics have already done, in this matter, very greatly more than any other religious body.

Under these circumstances we do not forget (we are not likely to forget it) the difficulty which an average Englishman has in bringing himself to deal with Catholics as he would deal with any other body of men under the same circumstances. Still less do we undervalue what must be felt by a statesman who, however strongly he may himself feel that we have established our claim to exceptional assistance, cannot forget that he has to defend and explain his conduct towards us, not before statesmen like himself, but in an assembly in which such men as Newdegate, Whalley, and their following, have seats and votes. But our confidence is up, that our appeal is made to a statesman who, in 1851, dared to stand, almost alone (against the madness which, for awhile, carried away both the great political parties) in opposition to Lord Russell's new penal law.

We ask Mr. Gladstone to judge whether we have not made out for Catholics a special and exceptional claim of justice, not for any assistance from the State towards teaching our religion to the children of that million of poor Irish who have been poured into the poorest quarters of our great towns, by the injustice and misgovernment which it is the special glory of his administration to have prevented for the future, but towards providing for them a secular education, of which they can avail themselves without violating their consciences, and without consenting to have the faith of their children "undermined."

What that special assistance should be, his statesmanlike genius will enable him to suggest much better than we; although the extremity of need and the sense of past injustice compel us to express in burning words the wrong which he has to redress. Is it too much to ask that, when he is cutting off for the future building grants for the provision of new schools, on his own declared ground ("The building of schools is the easiest of all the efforts made by their promoters. Their great difficulty is in the maintenance of schools;

and when we give liberal assistance to the maintenance, I think we may fairly leave to the locality the cost of the building"), he should make an exception in favour of Catholic schools, on the ground that in their case it is, not difficult but simply impossible, that the locality (however zealous in the cause of Catholic education the Catholics in it may be) could provide the necessary buildings? Would it be too much to ask that to Catholic schools in our great towns the building grant should be exceptionally continued, at least until it has been made available to Catholics for as many years as it has been made available to every other religious body in England?

And there is another ground upon which this special assistance is justly due to us. If voluntary schools are not provided in time, it is proposed that the School Boards should have the power of compelling the attendance of all children at the schools to be erected by rate. The teaching in these schools, whatever else it is, is to be distinctively Protestant. We do not forget that it is guarded by a conscience-clause. But this, although a real security to parents of the Established Church, the Wesleyans, &c., is to Catholic parents no security at all. It is but "a fraud, a delusion, and a snare." If it had been anything else the mixed system in Ireland would not have "undermined" (as Dr. Whately witnesses that it did) the faith of any Catholic child. Mr. Winterbotham's explanation of this fact is most true and sound. The chief Protestant bodies among us, although they have shades of difference in their organization and discipline, teach one and the same religion. A conscience-clause will protect the child of an Independent from being taught that three orders in the ministry were appointed by our Blessed Lord and His Apostles; and in all that is personal and practical to a child, the religious system of a school is the same, whether it is taught by a religious Episcopalian or by a religious Independent. But, as Mr. Winterbotham most truly says, no Catholic who deserves the name would believe that his child, even if withdrawn from the direct teaching of religious subjects, could breathe the atmosphere of a school Protestant in its master and in its pupils, without the risk of tarnishing, at least, its religious faith. We do not deny that some Catholic parents may be tempted, some compelled, to send their children to such schools. Such things have been done already, and may therefore be done again. But there is one fact for which we can answer, and which we beg all religious Protestants, and all sincere lovers of religious liberty, seriously to consider. There is, most assuredly, no one of these Catholic parents who does not, in his heart, believe that he is committing a sin, and doing a wrong and injury to his children, by sending them to such a school. Now is it, upon the lowest calculation, the interest of the State, that the moral character of

the parent (too often low enough already from the circumstances in which these poor people live) should be debased yet lower, even if there should be, to set against that degradation, some chance that the children may grow up, we will not say Protestants (there is no danger of that) but unsettled and indifferent to all religious belief. And this is the only effect which such schools are practically found to produce.

And if it should be by compulsion, not by milder inducements, that children are gathered into schools of a class which the parents in their hearts believe it to be a sin to allow them to attend, can anything more justly merit the name of religious persecution than this. How can this vast oppression be defended by men who complain of it as a grave injustice that any ratepayers should be called upon to contribute a few pence towards the secular teaching of a school, the religious teaching of which somewhat differs from their own opinions?

Think of it what men may, nothing on this earth is more certain than that it is a most real and serious violation of conscience, that any Catholic parent should be tempted, much more compelled, to send his children either to a secular school or to a Protestant school, even with a conscience clause. It is to prevent the enforcement of this violation of conscience that we demand such a degree of assistance as shall make it, we do not say easy, but conceivable, possible, that we may, by exertions beyond our means, provide Catholic schools for our poor Catholic children. If this is refused us, we may be forced to submit, because we are too weak to resist, but it will be with a burning sense of injustice and oppression, such as, in the language of Scripture, "drives wise men mad;" and it will be with a silent appeal to Him, before whose judgment seat we and these poor children and their oppressors must so soon meet to receive "the things done in the body, whether they be good or bad."

Of the conscience clause, as a security to Catholic children, compelled or tempted to attend Protestant schools, we have said enough. With regard to the enforcement of the "Time-table Conscience Clause" for Catholic schools as a condition of Government aid, we feel bound to say that we do not know and cannot undertake to foretell whether or not the managers of those schools will feel at liberty to avail themselves of it. Let it be remembered that the Protestant schoolmasters, of all denominations in London have unanimously protested against it, as limiting their power of religious teaching, and that it is admitted, even by Protestants, that it would interfere far more with our schools than with any others. This, however, it is not our part to decide. One thing at least is obvious. The mass of our schools are situated, not in remote situations, where no other school is within reach,

so that Protestant children residing immediately in the neighbourhood have no alternative, except to attend them or to go without schooling. They are in Liverpool, Manchester, and other great centres of population where Protestant schools are everywhere to be found. If the Time-table Clause is enforced as a condition of Government aid in Catholic schools thus situated, it will be evident that the object of its enforcement is not to secure the religion of Protestant children from being interfered with, but to interfere as far as possible with the religious teaching of the Catholic children. It is, therefore, a simple matter of justice, that if this clause is enforced at all, it should be only where it is necessary for the protection of Protestant children. Power should therefore, at the very least, be vested in the Educational Department to enforce this regulation in Catholic schools only where it seems to them to be necessary. It should not be in all cases a condition of Government aid.*

While we are on this subject, we feel bound to add, that in several Catholic schools known to us in which there are many Protestant children, the principle of the "conscience clause" has always been most fully, freely, and conscientiously carried out. We know none in which it has not been observed. We are acquainted with such schools, some in rural districts (where there are no Protestant schools in the immediate neighbourhood), and with some where there are Protestant schools, but where the Catholic schools are, for different reasons, preferred by some Protestant parents—and in every case known to us the parents have been asked whether they wished their children to receive the religious as well as the secular instruction—and no objection has been made to their attendance, even when the parents have requested that they should receive only the secular teaching of the school.

In conclusion, we will only add our strong conviction, that Catholics will be found ready cordially to co-operate in any plan of national education, upon the sole condition that it shall not be calculated directly or indirectly, openly or "unostentatiously," to interfere with or undermine the religion of the children; and that

* Our readers will remember that we have already quoted from the *Spectator* a passage exposing the injustice of compelling Catholics to accept this clause. The writer adds that 'it will be done 'needlessly,' because we believe that in practice Roman Catholic Schools will hardly ever have a Protestant scholar in them to be protected; so that this provision will, in fact, simply operate to cut them off from help in prosecuting a most praiseworthy public object—the education of the poor Roman Catholic children, without protecting any Protestant child's interests. Surely, if Roman Catholic schools in the Roman Catholic quarters of our great towns are well and ably taught to the satisfaction of the inspectors, and other Protestant schools are within reach for Protestant children, the former would deserve as much aid from the rates as the latter, in spite of their not separating the religious tone so completely.'

if any plan should, unhappily, be sanctioned by Parliament which is calculated to do so, there is no kind or degree of opposition which a Christian can consistently offer to any law of man, which such an educational system will not have to encounter, not merely in Parliament, where we have, unhappily, no voice, but in every parish and town in which any attempt is made to carry it into execution. For, dear to us and sacred as are the laws of our country, the law of God and the souls of our children are far dearer and more sacred.

It is a clear duty to do what we can towards obtaining the incorporation into the Government Bill, of provisions, as fair as possible, to the Catholic poor. But it is most certain that, when we have done our utmost, those terms will be practically unfair towards them as compared with the members of every other religious community. Against this there is but one thing to set, but that one is everything. On our side is Almighty God, whose revealed will and whose wonders of love and grace form the peculiar teaching of Catholic schools. And it must be added, that, few as are the wealthy members of the Catholic Church, they have means which make it just possible, however difficult, that they should provide what is required in order, by the blessing of God, to turn the Government Bill from an extreme danger to a benefit. If they begin by doing what they can, we may confidently trust that what remains will be supplied by the boundless liberality of our Catholic poor.

What is wanted at the present moment is that all Catholics above the poorest should come forward with a liberality fully up to or even exceeding their means. A noble example has been given, when the first public declaration (which appeared in the *Times* of July 5), combined two things, a strong protest against the injustice of the present Bill towards Catholics, and a list of contributions towards meeting the evil headed by the names of the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Howard of Glossop for £10,000 and £5,000 respectively. All that is practically required is that all among us should do as much in proportion to their means. No doubt if Catholics are to be the first in expenses of dress and entertainments, and all that constitutes worldly display, they must, whether they will or not, sacrifice the pleasure of responding worthily to calls like this. But that this will be their deliberate choice we cannot for a moment suppose.

ART. VII.—LOTHAIR.

Lothair. By the Right Honourable B. DISRAELI. London : Longmans, Green, & Co.

IF George Eliot or Anthony Trollope had chosen to make the life of a young Englishman of high rank, vast wealth, and but lately come of age, the theme of a three-volume novel ; and if, instead of the Marquis of Bute, who has merely become a Roman Catholic, the Marquis of Hastings or the Duke of Newcastle, who exercised their free will by embracing a different line of life not less conspicuous, were selected as its hero ; if their relatives and friends, some of whom the novelist had happened to come in contact with through opportunities of office, or at houses where he had been received as a friend, were portrayed under transparent disguises in caricatures of unaffected malignity, it is not difficult to imagine what would be the verdict of men of letters and men of honour on such a book and on its author. It might be asked, in the first place, whether inventive power is not the principal talent of a writer of fiction ; and whether the primary condition of its exercise is not the conception of perfectly original types of character, of ideal personages, never met with in the flesh, yet whom the author's imagination invests with a vivid, individual reality ; and its second condition, the construction of circumstances and situations of a curious and unprecedented novelty, which, nevertheless, are in perfect harmony with the unities of art and the nature of things. If, then, it came to be known that some eminent novelist had fallen into the habit of finding his characters at the dinner tables, and his incidents in the family history of his acquaintance ; that his books were only transparent travesties of events of the day, filled with venomous sketches of personages to whose intimacy he had, on different pretences, penetrated ; that his plot attributed to them motives as coarse as those of Greek bandits and tricks as base as those of Epsom jockeys, what would the world not say of such an unique development of moral and intellectual depravity ? But if this example came to be applauded and received as the rule of a new school of writers, then critics, skilled in the history of letters,—such a critic as Disraeli the Elder, for example,—would know that the time had come in which it only remained to study the successive stages of the decay of a once Fine Art. The standard of an eminent branch of modern literature would at once be lowered, and men would gradually come to

regard the profession of a novelist as one to be cut and black-balled. But what every writer of fiction, who aspires to a fair fame, would regard as a violation of the canons of his art, as well as of the ethics and etiquette of social life, it seems that a gentleman who lately occupied the situation of chief adviser of the Crown may do, not merely with impunity, but with almost general approval from the critics and the crowd. It is not, however, we may be permitted to suspect, every topic of high life, as open to free treatment as the conversion of Lord Bute, that even Mr. Disraeli, in all the exuberant insolence of this aftermath of his fancy, would have ventured to treat in a novel. We live in a time, unhappily, fertile in bizarre effects and sensational situations. But if (to take the last sad vicissitudes of aristocratic life in England on which the white light of the law and the beacon flame of the press have flared)—if Mr. Disraeli had made the history of *Lothair* blend the follies of Lord Courtenay with some of the more suspicious incidents of the Mordaunt case, and if he had wantonly and unwarrantably brought a Prince of the Blood instead of a Prince of the Church on the stage, would not all England have rung with a cry of shame? It is still safe, however, it seems, to violate every rule of art and every sanction of society, where the Catholic Church is in any way concerned. The end justifies the means when Titus Oates, in three volumes, exposes the last Popish Plot.

"But why," may some of the chorus of indolent reviewers exclaim—"why identify Lord Bute with *Lothair*, or name the name of the Cardinal? Why not ignore what every one knows? In a system like yours, one expects to find hypocrisy more elaborately and artistically organized." Mr. Goldwin Smith has been very hardly handled by the editor of the *Times*, for saying that the Oxford Professor's cap fitted his head to a nicety; and it was ironically hoped, on that occasion, that Mr. Phœbus or Mr. Pinto would be the next to avow himself. Now this is a point, we submit with all the respect that is due to so great an authority, upon which some consideration is due to the author's avowed wishes. What the critics, possibly already beginning to repent of their blunder of a sudden, wish to ignore, and what we presume to regard simply as a scandal against the laws of letters and society, is formally pleaded by Mr. Disraeli as his especial merit. In the official synopsis of the story issued by Messrs. Longmans,* it is premised that no small part of its

* Notes on Books, being an analysis of the works published during each quarter by Messrs. Longmans & Co., vol. iv. No. lxi.

interest is due "to the introduction of familiar forms, veiled beneath disguises thinner than the drapery of a Grecian statue." This sentence has, it seems to us, the even swing of Mr. Disraeli's own style. It might be read as a part of that paragraph in which the "divine Theodora" is described with her Olympian countenance, her Phidian face, and her Greek fillets. The very figure occurs in a passage where Theodora exhibits to Lothair a new American statue in the grounds at Belmont:—"Though veiled with drapery which might have become the Goddess of Modesty, admirable art permitted the contour of the perfect form to be traced." But there is at all events one place where even the drapery is dispensed with, and where the author, as it were inadvertently, drops the key of the book. Every reader of "*Lothair*" remembers the touch of art not meant to conceal but to reveal his artfulness, by which Mr. Disraeli once misprints Capel for Catesby*; and of course every one knows that Monsignor Capel received into the Church the year before last, a young nobleman, "whose vast inheritance is in many counties, and more than one kingdom." After all, there are not so many of them. Need his name be named?

Of course, as old novel readers remember, it is not the first offence of its kind which Mr. Disraeli has committed. There was a time when some one, obviously a critic, wished that his enemy would write a book; but Mr. Disraeli's impulse, on the contrary, has always been, as soon as he had made or flattered himself that he had made an enemy, to write a book, and to regard his book as a pillory on which to plant his enemy. From his earliest youth the many great qualities which he possesses have been marred by occasional outbursts of preposterous vanity and unruly vindictiveness. The morbid spleen and the vaulting egotism of his earlier writings were excused as the petulant protests of a young man of genius against a period in which he felt that he had not succeeded so rapidly as he deserved; who felt, perhaps, that he might never succeed to the point of his ambition, because of the bitter and obstinate prejudice of the country in which he was born against the race to which he belonged. He said in those days, "Every man has a right to be vain until he has succeeded." This sentence, whose moral would hardly commend itself to Epicurus, not to say Solomon, might be concluded in the same strain now-a-days, "No man who has succeeded has a right to be either vain or vindictive." Mr. Disraeli has succeeded

* Vol. iii. p. 254.

with a great success. He has held, for a time, that office whose power is greater than the power of any sovereign on the globe, save one. He, too, has made an archbishop, who is, in a sort of a way, the Head of a Church. He has made a duke; an Irish duke, certainly, in a peerage which now only exists upon paper, but who is, nevertheless, a duke, so far as the title goes, quite as much as any Sicilian or Dutch duke. He has given the Garter, and sighed, it was whispered, and glanced at his own knee as he did so. The title of Beaconsfield buckles the illustrious and venerable name of Edmund Burke to his name; a name lustrous certainly, but which, especially considering his last performance, hardly attracts homage. He has, if we may affect the grandiloquent strain of his younger days, controlled the conscience of the Monarch, and enlarged the liberties of the Multitude. But he has not yet learned that magnanimity is the true temper of a statesman. Whoso stands upon that lofty height, whence are swayed the civil destinies of one-sixth of the whole mass of mankind, of every race and creed and clime, should, if he have it not from nature, acquire, or at least affect, the majestic equanimity which is not less proper to a British Premier than to a Greek demigod. Some men, Mr. Disraeli's inferiors in those gifts which are ordinarily ascribed to genius, have sat in the great chair of the Imperial Council. It would be unfair to class him with Mr. Addington, who, after he had attained supreme office, treated Mr. Pitt somewhat as Lord Derby was treated last session, or to compare his talent to that of Lord Goderich, whose ministry was of as transitory a tenure. But who can imagine Sir Robert Peel, after he had fallen from office through the agency of what he regarded as an unnatural combination, actuated by the basest and most vindictive motives, indefatigably employing the period of his retreat to concoct a romance, in which an Irish demagogue, named MacDaniel, should be represented as suborning a Jewish gentleman of the press, named Ben Judah, with part of the Repeal Rent to subvert the Protestant Constitution, equally obnoxious to both the helot-born? The claims and the balance-weight of the Irish Catholics have wrecked more ministries since the Union than all other political questions and parties added together; and the line that was taken by some of their leaders and some of their bishops on the question of the Veto was very perplexing and even exasperating to several of the statesmen of the period of the Regency. But who can conceive Mr. Canning yielding to the temptation of writing a comedy in which Dr. Doyle should figure, in as thin a disguise as Mr. Disraeli has cast round the character of the

eminent personage whom he has chosen to name Doctor Churchill? Mr. Pitt, too, had his difficulties on this subject, in the royal closet, with his party, with those to whom he made promises which he not merely could not fulfil, but which he was obliged to break. His position was in many ways awkward, but his austere and impassable dignity sustained him through its severest stress. He did his duty, and died, and left his honour to history.

This book is, we maintain, an offence, even a gross offence, against the certainly undefined, but nevertheless well-understood rules, which bind the conduct of gentlemen, of statesmen, and of men of letters. But it is also, we perceive, regarded in certain quarters as a most subtle and formidable attack on the spirit and system of the Roman Catholic Church. In this regard it is about as worthy of serious notice as General O'Neill's recent equally profound and masterly attack upon the British Empire. The Church of Rome and the British Empire are, in truth, the better of such attacks now and then. They test strength; they clear the air; they, perhaps, prove men's mettle. And Roman Catholics, at all events, are simply not capable of feeling even the same degree of vexation at this sudden somewhat treacherous volley fired into their flank by a statesman who but lately wished to be regarded as their natural ally, that ordinary Englishmen feel at the more recent and not less grotesque and ignoble Fenian raid on the Canadian frontier. The judicious will take note that Mr. Disraeli is not a safe person with whom to transact public affairs, when Catholic Interests require, as unfortunately they too often do, to be brought before statesmen in office or in opposition. Some Catholics, however, far from regarding "*Lothair*" as a signal of rupture, and as a sort of curiously-prolonged and melodiously-modulated No Popery Cry, are so very charitable as to suppose that Mr. Disraeli meant by his picturesque delineation of some of the characters in this story to give, as through a glass darkly, and in outlines blurred here and there, an image not all unfaithful notwithstanding, of the power and beauty which attend the action of the Church. We have the honour to be Mr. Disraeli's very obedient humble servants; and without at all accepting Mr. O'Connell's savage, however grossly-provoked version of his genealogy, we may, perhaps, in regard to this far too highly-exalted view of the subject, presume to say that the Church of Christ does not stand in need of the right honourable gentleman's furtively (we had almost said, jesuitically) insinuated patronage.

Some future collector of Curiosities of Literature will doubtless trace with critical skill the causes and the ways whereby

that great design of an epic, through whose execution the name of Disraeli the Younger was to have passed to posterity in the same rank with those of Homer, Virgil, Dante, and Milton, so dwindled away in its author's mind and got so encrusted with the weed and the drift of commonplace life, that when it appeared as a novel, in all the yet frolicsome buoyancy of his irreverent senectitude, it only landed him in a place to be settled by posterity as somewhat lower than that of M. Eugène Sue, though undoubtedly higher than that of Mr. G. W. M. Reynolds. It was on the plains of Troy that the idea, which may be called the germ of "Lothair," first quickened in Mr. Disraeli's mind. The incubation has been prolonged, not merely for the Horatian nine, but for nine years four times told, of much meditation and many vicissitudes. He had arrived at the mature age of thirty when he saw his long locks mirrored in Scamander's stream; but he had only then begun to experience the delirious dreams of youth. The cold, coarse breath of London life had prematurely aged the heart of the Hebrew boy, and "Vivian Grey" was in truth the work of a *blasé* sage of eighteen. But, nearing the half-way stage of life, when he touched the soil of Asia, his vanished youth suddenly returned like the summer of Saint Martin, with a gorgeous glow, and a turbulent rush of fantastic fancies, and an obstreperous ambition, and all the dear delightful froth and fireworks of heyday. There where the wisdom of Ulysses and the eloquence of Thersites seemed to haunt the air, he underwent that "baphometic fire-baptism" which has produced a character that is still such a strange amalgam of Eastern fire and Western phlegm. There that mind received its settled form, which equally loves to dwell demure in the region of respectable platitude, or to soar in an empyrean of riotous ideality, curiously resembling a Yankee store far-west, where sometimes you come on petroleum and sometimes on shoddy. There, in fine, never contemplating that his name would one day be written in the list of the Grand Viziers of Great Britain, he pondered the even more audacious achievement of adding a second great epic to the English language; and awfully aspired to do for Napoleon what Milton had done for the Devil.

This is the preface of "the Revolutionary Epick," which is on the title-page described as "The Work of Disraeli the Younger, Author of 'The Psychological Romance.'"

It was on the plains of Troy that I first conceived the idea of this work Wandering over that illustrious scene, surrounded by the tombs of heroes and by the confluence of poetic streams, my musing thoughts clustered round

the memory of that immortal song, to which all creeds and countries alike respond, which has vanquished Chance, and defies Time. Deeming myself, perchance, too rashly, in that excited hour, a Poet, I cursed the destiny that had placed me in an age that boasted of being anti-poetical. And while my Fancy thus struggled with my Reason, it flashed across my mind, like the lightning which was then playing over Ida, that in those great poems which rise, the pyramids of poetic art, amid the falling and the fading splendour of less creations, the Poet hath ever embodied the spirit of his Time. Thus, the most heroic incident of an heroic age produced in the *Iliad* an Heroic Epick; thus, the consolidation of the most superb of Empires, produced in the *Æneid* a Political Epick; the revival of Learning, and the birth of vernacular Genius, presented us in the *Divine Comedy* with a National Epick; and the Reformation and its consequences called from the rapt lyre of Milton a Religious Epick.

And the spirit of my Time, shall it alone be uncelebrated?

Standing upon Asia, and gazing upon Europe, with the broad Hellespont alone between us, and the shadow of Night descending on the mountains, these mighty continents appeared to me as it were the Rival Principles of Government, that at present contend for the mastery of the world. "What!" I exclaimed, "is the Revolution of France a less important event than the siege of Troy? Is Napoleon a less interesting character than Achilles? For me remains the Revolutionary Epick."

Full of these thoughts, I descended to the shore, and again embarking, a favouring breeze filled our languid sails; and as the morning broke over the waters of the Propontic Sea, I beheld the glittering minarets and the cypress groves of the last city of the Cæsars.

In that delightful metropolis, more than once my thoughts recurred to my Dardanian reverie; but the distraction of far travel, and the composition of two works long meditated—one devoted to the delineation of the Poetic Character, the other to the celebration of a gorgeous incident in the annals of that sacred and romantic people from whom I derive my blood and name,*—finally expelled from my thoughts a conception which, in truth, I deemed too bold.

My return to the strife of civilization recalled old musings; and the work, first conceived amid the sunny isles of the Egean, I have lived to mature, and in great part compose, on the shores of a colder sea, but not less famous land. Yet I have ventured to submit to the public but a small portion of my creation, and even that, with unaffected distrust and sincere humility. Whatever may be their decision, I shall bow to it without a murmur; for I am not one who find consolation for the neglect of my contemporaries in the

* Both these works have been since published: the first is "The Psychological Romance," published under the bibliopolic baptism of "Contarini Fleming," which means nothing: the second is "The Wondrous Tale of Alroy." With respect to the title of the present poem, let me remind hypercritics that *Epick* is a good substantive, and as such is admitted into the classical dictionary of our language.

imaginary plaudits of a more sympathetic Posterity. The public will, then, decide whether this work is to be continued and completed ; and if it pass in the negative, I shall, without a pang, hurl my lyre to Limbo.

The two first books of this revolutionary Epick comprise the pleadings of the rival Genii. The action of the fable commences with the third book. This work, if it be permitted to proceed, will, I hope, evolve a moral, which governors and the governed may alike peruse with profit, and which may teach wisdom both to monarchs and to multitudes.

The public did not, it seems, decide that the specimen of the "Revolutionary Epick" submitted to its view was, on the whole, worthy to be ranked with the "Iliad," the "Æneid," the "Divine Comedy," or even "Paradise Lost;" and Mr. Disraeli has, no doubt, kept his word, and done with his lyre as he promised. He has long ago resigned the hope of teaching wisdom, in this particular way at least, to monarchs and to multitudes; and is now content, taking his motto from Terence—

Nosse omnia hæc salus est adolescentulis,

to point out the path of salvation to the golden youth who dwell at the West-end and glitter in the Row. But he has never abandoned the design of painting in a work of imagination the play of the two principles that as he believes contend for the mastery of the world. The revival of the French Empire by a prince, who has tried to find an equilibrium for his throne by balancing the influence of the Revolution against the influence of the Church, evidently banished from his mind the idea of making the first Napoleon his hero. A great poet, almost worshipped by Mr. Disraeli in his youth, has declared that a hero is "an uncommon want;" and it must be admitted that there is some difficulty in finding one near our time suitable to an ambitious genius, who has felt constrained by conventional considerations to relinquish Napoleon Bonaparte. Mr. Disraeli, like Lord Byron, doubtless sometimes said, pondering the many names of famous heroes since Agamemnon,

I condemn none

But can't find any in the present age

Fit for my poem (that is, for my new one);

and so at last it happened that he decided instead on having a heroine, an actual heroine with a nominal hero. The circumstances of a time in which his ambition grew giddy, while his temper was tolerably, or, let it even be admitted,

intolerably tried—the time when he discovered that there was a great combination of Ritualists and Romanists against the English Church, and that the Church of Rome was an Established Church in every country on the globe—these, we say, gave a different form and a common-place colour to the crude and gaudy vision which was first revealed by the lightnings of *Ida* and fanned by the breezes of the *Dardanelles*. The conversion of one of the greatest of the Tory toparchs to the Catholic Church about the same time presented a promising thread for the narrative. And so a party land-slip, a nine days' wonder of the town, an unsatisfactory intrigue, end in the right honourable gentleman's all at once dropping from the magnificent aspiration of being the ultimate rival of *Homer*, to the solid satisfaction of being the favourite client of *Mr. Mudie*. Long in the alembic of his imagination had the great design remained suspended in solution. At last a sudden touch crystallized it. The gorgeous epic that was to have won the suffrages of the world and the ages subsided into an ordinary tale of the town and the season. So can we conceive some ingenious and enthusiastic alchemist of the Middle Ages, who, projecting diamonds and sapphires, finds at last, after life-long labour, at the bottom of his crucible only a tawdry deposit of *Bluestone* and *Glauber salts*. The morsel of sham gem, however, the great character of the book, on whom its movement depends, whose influence rules all round her, who gives it whatever of epic impulse and consistency it has, its heroine, in fact, is undoubtedly the lady who is sometimes called *Mary Anne* and sometimes *Theodora Campian*. It is a remarkable character assuredly, a very remarkable character, but unluckily for *Mr. Disraeli's* reputation as a writer of fiction, it is not what can, with any reasonable degree of candour, be called an original character. As he, no doubt unconsciously, borrowed his speech on the Duke of Wellington's death from *M. Thiers's* panegyric of *General Foy*, so he has in some strange state of intellectual somnambulism eloped with his revolutionary heroine, and indeed with a good many of her properties and accidents, straightway from the fostering care of no less excellent a writer of fiction than *Miss Amelia B. Edwards*.

Mr. Disraeli's character is certainly peculiar, and in some respects may be characterised as rather abnormal than original. He avows that he has got two consciences—a historical conscience, as well as the ordinary one common to us all, but which must be weakened in him, we fear, by the somewhat polypous growth of the other. He possesses a very powerful memory, and

also a very powerful imagination; but there would seem to be no boundary between them. With him the memory overlaps the imagination, and the imagination extravasates into the memory. Mr. Disraeli is not capable, we should wish to believe, of deliberately stealing a speech from M. Thiers; he has made quite as many, if not more, and quite as good, if not better, speeches than M. Thiers. Is he capable of the still more silly and easily-detected misdemeanour of appropriating part of a plot and its principal characters from a popular novel hardly four years old? We should prefer to think otherwise. But the facts are very strange and very strong. Probably their true interpretation is that Mr. Disraeli is subject occasionally to a mental malady, which was not known when his father studied so profoundly the character, the amenities, and the calamities of authors, and which, for want of a better name, we may perhaps venture to call Literary Kleptomania.

Miss Edwards published, in the year 1866, a story called "*Half a Million of Money*."* Its hero, Saxon Trefalden, is a young man, the heir to an enormous fortune, who has been brought up in a very rude and simple fashion in a Swiss valley by his uncle and guardian, a man of austere religious principles; just as Lothair "was brought up in the Highlands with a rather savage uncle." At twenty young Trefalden is utterly ignorant of the ways of the world, and of the use and value of money. Of Lothair it is said, at the same age: "It is curious that his first dinner at Brentham was almost his first introduction into refined society. He had been a guest at the occasional banquets of his uncle; but these were festivals of the Picts and Scots; rude plenty and coarse splendour, with noise instead of conversation, and a tumult of obstructive dependents, who impeded by their want of skill the very convenience which they were purposed to facilitate." The Picts and Scots who welcomed Mr. Disraeli to Edinburgh evidently impressed him favourably. As Saxon Trefalden approaches the period when he will inherit his vast fortune, he falls simultaneously under two opposite influences—that of his kinsman William Trefalden, a keen and unscrupulous London lawyer, and that of Olimpia Colonna, a Roman lady of marvellous beauty, and a fanatical propagandist of the Revolution. Let us compare Miss Edwards's description of this lady, who is occasionally called by her worshippers "*Santa Olimpia*," with Mr. Disraeli's description of the "*divine Theodora*."

* "*Half a Million of Money*." A novel. By Amelia B. Edwards, author of "*Barbara's History*," etc. etc. London: Tinsley Brothers.

OLIMPIA.

He could not have described her to save his life. He had no idea whether her wondrous eyes were brown or black, or whether it was to them or to the perfect mouth beneath that her smile owned the magic of its sweetness. He had not the faintest suspicion that her hair was of the same hue and texture as the world-famed locks of Lucrezia Borgia; he only saw that it was turned back from her brow like a cloud of burnt gold, crisp and wavy, and gathered into a coronet that a queen might have envied. He knew not how scornfully her lip could curl and her delicate nostrils quiver; but he could not help seeing how there was something haughty in the very undulations of her tall and slender form, and something imperial in the character of her beauty . . . A really graceful, handsome, highly-bred woman was a phenomenon in Saxon's eyes; and he looked upon her with much the same kind of delightful awe that one experiences on first beholding the sea or the southern stars. Indeed, had Mademoiselle Colonna been only a fine portrait by Titian, or a marble divinity by Phidias, he could hardly have admired her with a more dispassionate and simple wonder (pp. 135-6).

THEODORA.

It was the face of a matron apparently of not many summers, for her shapely figure was still slender, though her mien was stately. But it was the countenance that had commanded the attention of Lothair: pale, but perfectly Attic in outline, with the short upper lip and round chin, and a profusion of dark chestnut hair, bound by a Grecian fillet, and on her brow a star . . . (p. 69). Lothair thought he had never seen any one or anything so serene; the serenity however, not of humbleness, nor of merely conscious innocence; it was not devoid of a degree of majesty; what one pictures of Olympian repose, and the countenance was Olympian; a Phidian face with large grey eyes and dark lashes; wonderful hair abounding without art, and gathered together by Grecian fillets (p. 203) . . . As an astronomer surveys the starry heavens until his searching eyes reach the desired planet, so Lothair's scrutinising vision wandered till his eyes at length lighted on the wished-for orb. . . . He had read of such countenances in Grecian dreams, in Corinthian temples, in fanes of Ephesus, in the radiant shadow of divine groves (p. 216).

Here are precisely the same salient points to describe, the peculiar tint and abundance of auburn hair, the "Phidian" face, the slender, dignified form, the serenity as of stars, the majestic repose, the irresistible fascination of manner. Theodora and Olimpia are at least twins. About Theodora also there is an "Olympian repose," and she has got an "Olympian countenance." We should find it difficult to understand why the adjective Olympian is used twice over in a way so perplexing, were it not that Miss Edwards spells the word Olimpia with an "i" instead of with a "y," as Mr. Disraeli spells it. He has as good reasons for doing so, doubtless, as he gives for spelling "epick" with a "k." Why so much fuss about Phidias and Olympus? Are there so many busts by Phidias in existence that one can tell what is a Phidian face? If Mr. Disraeli does not refer to Olimpia, but Olympus, when he fabricates the adjective Olympian, he might just

as well speak of a Ben Lomond brow or a Magillicuddy chin. He flings about his scraps of Greek like one of Mr. Cook's tourists prodigal of half a dozen precious morsels of *table d'hôte* French. But this is not all. When Captain Bruges, in "Lothair," speaks to Mirandola of the influence of Theodora over the secret societies, he says: "The name of Mary Anne is a name of magic; though never mentioned, it is never forgotten, and the slightest allusion to it will open every heart. There are more secret societies in France at this moment than at any period since 1785, though you hear nothing of them; and they believe in Mary Anne and in nothing else." Mirandola himself is thus addressed and described by Captain Bruges: "My dear Mirandola, there is no living man who appreciates your genius and your worth more than myself; perhaps I might say there is no living man who has had equal opportunities of estimating them. You formed the mind of our country; you kindled and kept alive the sacred flame when all was gloom, and all were without heart. Such prodigious devotion, so much resource and patience and pertinacity, such unbroken spirit were never before exhibited by man; and whatever may be said by your enemies, I know that at the greatest hour of action you proved equal to it." In Miss Edwards's story, the character to which Mr. Disraeli has given the name of Mirandola, is Giulio Colonna, the father of Olimpia, and this is the way in which father and daughter are described to Saxon Trefalden by his kinsman the London lawyer. "Giulio Colonna has been an enthusiast all his life. In his youth he married for love; and for the last twenty or thirty years he has devoted himself heart and soul to Italian politics. He has written more pamphlets and ripened more plots than any man in Europe. He is at the bottom of every Italian conspiracy. He is at the head of every secret society that has Italian unity for its object. He is, in short, a born agitator; and his daughter is as fanatical as himself. As you saw them just now, so they are always: he with his head full of plots, she exercising all her woman's wit and energy to enlist or utilize an ally. . . . She is beautiful and brilliant and very fascinating; and she knows how to employ her power, too. Those eyes of Olimpia Colonna's have raised more volunteers for Italy than all her father's plots." In fact, the function of Giulio Colonna is the function of Mirandola, and the function of Theodora is the function of Olimpia. But, moreover, it is all wrought out in precisely the same way. As Theodora, on a visit to Muriel Towers, is suddenly summoned by Captain Bruges to start the revolutionary movement which ended at Mentana, and

fascinates Lothair until he involves himself in it, and flings down his purse and picks up a sword at her bidding,—so Olimpia, on a visit at Castle Towers, receives a message from Baldiserroti, announcing Garibaldi's expedition to Sicily, induces Saxon Trefalden to give her a blank cheque to buy muskets and munitions, and sends him to the seat of war, where he turns up just in time for the battle of Melazzo. Both Theodora and Olimpia join the campaign, and both wear men's clothes in camp. Here it may surely be said are coincidences curious enough. But a still more striking illustration of the inextricable intermixture of Mr. Disraeli's memory and imagination remains. As in one page of *Lothair* he misprints, we believe, by design, the name of Capel for Catesby, so in another, he, by an astounding blunder, proves how he got all the revolutionary half of his plot by appropriating the very name of Colonna.

"The Mary Anne Societies," says a despatch, which Theodora reads, "are not strong enough for the situation—too local; he listens to them, but he has given no pledge. We must go deeper. 'Tis an affair of MADRE NATURA. Thou must see Colonna."

"Colonna is at Rome," said the General, "and cannot be spared. He is Acting President of the National Committee, and has enough upon his hands."

"I must see him," said Theodora.

And she sees him and sends him to Paris, having first given him a broad hint that he ought to assassinate the Emperor. Miss Edwards's Colonna "is at the bottom of every Italian conspiracy. He is at the head of every secret society that has Italian unity for its object." Mr. Disraeli's Colonna is "Acting President of the National Committee," and "chief of the oldest, the most powerful, and the most occult of the secret societies of Italy." What the chances are that would admit of the same character, with the same name and the same attributes, appearing by mere fortuitous coincidence in two novels between the dates of whose publication there was an interval of four years, is one of those problems which would exhaust the resources of logarithms and baffle Babbage's calculating machine.

We abandon to some expert in the art of literary vivisection the comparison in detail of "*Half a Million of Money*" with "*Lothair*." The question as to which is the better novel, according to all accepted standards, bears but slight discussion. Originality of conception is one such standard. That need hardly be mentioned. Delineation of character is another. Miss Edwards has produced her characters by effort

of imagination, and they are all finely individualized and coherent. Mr. Disraeli, on the other hand, has sketched half his characters from life, after the manner of a pictorial caricaturist, and acquired the others by petty larceny, or say piracy, which seems to be, in literary transgressions, the more accepted phrase. Miss Edwards's plot is her own; Mr. Disraeli has, so to speak, laid a plot for his plot. It is the result of "treason, stratagem, and spoil," not of fancy, reverie, and study. Mr. Disraeli's style certainly has more point and finish, more precision and sparkle. There is great grace, of a somewhat Cuyyp-like character, in some of his descriptions of quiet scenery. But his upholstery, on the other hand, and he has a passion for upholstery, is as gaudy as that of Mr. Robins, the auctioneer. We seem to pace in his pages up and down a sort of "earthly paradise of ormolu." There are "bits" here and there of boyish buoyancy, quips of humour and fancy, which it is quite wonderful to think of as flashing out of a brain so *rusé* and so *blasé*, but on which, in some respects, the difference between the "teens" and the "tys" seems to have hardly told. There is not much to choose, in our opinion, between the way in which Miss Edwards describes high life, obviously evolving it from her interior consciousness to a considerable degree, and the way in which Mr. Disraeli, who has had more opportunities than the oldest peer, does so. But, strictly considered, his very high folk, especially his dukes and duchesses, have an air of the stage about them, and are made to talk "rank" as people some degrees lower in the social scale are said to talk "shop." Miss Edwards has suggested to that retentive imagination and that brilliant memory more, we suspect, even than the characters of Theodora and Colonna. The figure and manner of Lady Castletowers will, perhaps, requite a study more ingenious than ours. The way in which a young millionaire leans on his attorney, as he makes his first blunders, must, we presume, be incapable of much diversity, for what Mr. Putney Giles is to Lothair that Mr. William Trefalden is to Saxon, until he takes to plundering him. Even the diversion of race, which gives a sort of subtle relief to "Lothair," has been anticipated by Miss Edwards. Here is a sentence every one will recognize as quite in the style of Mr. Disraeli's Aryan and Semitic passages:—"Only the historian and the archæologist care to remember how there lie embedded in that tongue the lost fragments of a forgotten language; and how, in the veins of the simple mountaineers who speak it, there yet linger some drops of the blood of a lost, a mighty, and a mysterious people." We can hardly persuade ourselves that this

sentence was not uttered by Mr. Phœbus, but unquestionably it was in "Half a Million of Money" we found it. It is strange that among the many novelists who write about the byways of London life, Mr. Disraeli and Miss Edwards should have such a peculiarly acute sense of the sound of the muffin-bell on a foggy evening. It would not count if there were not so very many other curious coincidences; but we willingly register the exquisite variation in "*Lothair*." When Mr. Disraeli contrasts the note of the nightingale with the tinkle of the muffin-bell, we feel that this is just what Hafiz would have said if Hafiz had happened to have been born a Cockney.

But, notwithstanding his memory and his imagination, Mr. Disraeli is a man of genius, and the homage which that supreme intellectual culmination owes to truth is like the relation of beauty of physical form to grace of movement. Where the figure is symmetrical, its attitudes and action are unconsciously easy and harmonious. It needs some perverse effort, or the action of some evil passion, to make them awkward and ungainly. And so it is in some degree with the workings of the higher form of intellect. Genius naturally tends to reverence and reflect even the very truth of truths, which it cannot fathom and will not worship, but may not ignore. It would be as impossible for Mr. Disraeli to hold in his mind for an hour, without some degree of injury to its faculty or capacity, the same view of the Catholic Church which Mr. Newdegate no doubt sincerely holds, and so far without apparent damage to his certainly very commonplace mental qualities, as it would be for him (we compare little things with great), suddenly to assume the same view of the French Empire as commends itself most naturally to the rather limited comprehension of M. Gustave Flourens or M. Ulric de Fonvielle. Hence it happens that there is a certain law of his mind, which obliges him, in describing such characters as Cardinal Grandison and the St. Jeromes, and Clare Arundel, and Monsignor Catesby, or Monsignor Berwick, to make them live, and move, and speak, so that they shall be, in some degree, true to the ideal of dignity and humility, of gentleness and zeal, of purity, and charity, and courage, which, as he very well knows (his earlier books testify it) habitually informs the Catholic character in every high expression of it. But, on the other hand, this book has its purpose, and the purpose is so bad that it at once lands Mr. Disraeli into utterly false art. It is absurd to suppose that the men and women whom he describes as of so elevated and refined a cast of character would attempt to compass such an end as the conversion of a young countryman by getting a

Roman tailor's wife to personate an apparition of the Blessed Virgin; or by persuading him, against the evidence of his own senses, that he had fought with the Pontifical troops instead of the Garibaldians at Mentana; or that the mere act of holding a candle in his hand at a particular procession had changed him into a Roman Catholic. M. Eugène Sue would, we think, have managed all this much more consistently, and quite as wickedly at the same time. The audience of Parisian *flâneurs* and artizans whom M. Sue addressed were as ready to believe anything he wished about the Jesuits in particular, as the less civilized of the English middle classes are to believe anything whatsoever about Popery in general. But the reader of Paris *feuilletons* is a much more critical reader than the subscriber to Mr. Mudie; and if Père d'Aigrigny, and Rodin, and Madame de Saint Dizier had been coloured so favourably as Mr. Disraeli colours his Catholic characters at times, and yet had plotted so stupidly at the end as Mr. Disraeli makes his people plot, the keen *flâneur* would have decided offhand that M. Sue was either tending to become *dévot*, or was getting *ramollissement du cerveau*.

But, after all, are we quite justified in treating "Lothair" absolutely as a mere novel, like the "Wandering Jew," or "Half a Million of Money," with a moral which is antipathetic to our way of thinking? Perhaps it has been too hastily supposed that Mr. Disraeli only wishes to rescue the young aristocracy from the antagonistic spells of Rome and the Revolution. Certainly, if the golden youth of England were such as it is depicted in "Lothair;" if it were composed only of Saint Aldegondes, and Hugo Bohuns, and Bertrams, and Carisbrookes, and Montairys, or at best of Brecons and Lothairs, there would not seem to be so much will and manhood to spare among them that either side should gain very considerably by their adhesion. As a sketch of the minds and manners of the young heirs of "our old nobility," some future historian, (not necessarily a New Zealander,) perhaps a professor in the University of Andaman, or the Gibbon of Patagonia, may contrast certain passages from "Lothair" with select excerpts from the "Satires" of Juvenal, not without an edifying effect on the morals of the twenty-fourth or twenty-fifth century; and he will naturally argue that, whereas Juvenal's evidence is to be regarded with grave suspicion, in consequence of his well-known animosity to the whole Court of the excellent and beneficent (through the researches of a late learned scholar, happily rehabilitated) Emperor Nero, no such doubt can at all attach to the testimony of Sir Benjamin, who is proved by the curious and invaluable

contemporary "Brown Memoirs," to have possessed the entire confidence of his sovereign, and to have been the chosen leader and even educator of the English aristocracy at the time that he thus drew them to the life. The book itself, he may continue to argue, was obviously intended as an educational work, perhaps one of a series. *Nösse omnia hæc salus est adolescentulis*. What are "all these things" which it is good for the young to know? Not merely to resist the influence of that ephemeral movement, called "the Revolution," in the absurdly hallucinated century which preceded the great Council of the Vatican. So profound a thinker would as soon have thought of advising the English nobility not to take to baby-farming or to enter the ranks of "the Peculiar People." The true view to take of "Lothair" it will be argued, is, rather to regard it as a choice collection of apothegms and aphorisms, conveyed in the ancient Oriental vehicle of dramatic dialogue. So the young British aristocrat (if of very high rank, generally spoken of in those days as Swell) is told at one time by the lips of Mr. Phœbus: "To render his body strong and supple is the first duty of man. He should develope and completely master the whole muscular system. What I admire in the order to which you belong is that they live in the air, that they excel in athletic sports, that they can only speak one language, and that they never read. This is not a complete education, but it is the highest education since the Greek." And again, he is instructed by Hugo Bohun: "The high mode for a real swell is to have a theatre . . . You ought to have a theatre; and if there is not one to have, you should build one." What a real swell should eat in the month of November, we are told by St. Aldegonde: "What I want in November is a slice of cod and a beef-steak, and, by Jove, I never could get them in the North; I was obliged to come to town. It is no joke to have to travel three hundred miles for a slice of cod and a beef-steak." Lord Montairy, we think it is, who says: "To throw over a host is the most heinous of social crimes. It ought never to be pardoned." Mr. Pinto's impartial criticism on the dialect prevalent in high society towards the end of the third quarter of the nineteenth century deserves to be commemorated:—"English is an expressive language, but not difficult to master. Its range is limited. It consists, as far as I can observe, of four words: 'nice,' 'jolly,' 'charming,' and 'bore,' and some grammarians add 'fond.'" Lothair himself lets us into a strange secret of high life. He says once, in a very serious mood, "When all the daughters are married, nobody eats luncheon." These homely touches are about the most valuable material of history. When our

Andamanian or Patagonian professor analyses the character of an aristocracy who never read, who keep theatres, who travel hundreds of miles through fog to eat cod and beef-steak, who use only five words of their own language, and who abandon their principal meal for such an utterly trivial reason, no doubt his commentary will be ample and energetic. The chief cause of the Decline and Fall of the British Empire will at once have been made manifest.

What throwing over a host really means, and why it should be regarded with such unrelenting animosity, are questions which belong to the exact class of topics on which true scholars have in all ages loved to write libraries. The method of dealing with disappointed affections practised among persons of quality in our day, will, no doubt, seem very empirical seven or eight hundred years hence; but it may, perhaps, tend to revive the study of mineral waters. We refer, of course, to the melodious and memorable passage in which it is said that "the blighted hopes have gone to Cowes, and the broken hearts to Baden"—a line which so naturally flows into the air of "the Boyne Water" that we should not be surprised if a setting of it to that tune by Mr. Disraeli's secretary were found among the already cited "Brown Papers" on the occasion of the sack of Balmoral by the allied troops of the Siberians and Ashantees.

Some of what appear to be Mr. Disraeli's own more immediate opinions, nevertheless, now and then transpire. "To be a renegade," he says once, "without the consolation of conscience" (the historic conscience, we assume), "this is agony mixed with self-contempt." Again, an opinion on the nature of originality in art which is attributed to Mr. Phœbus is evidently the conviction of a more distinguished person. "A fascinating subject," said old Cecrops to Mr. Phœbus, "but not a very original one." "The originality of a subject is in its treatment," was the reply. Sometimes, hardly even in its treatment, we may remind the discriminating reader. This is not improbably Mr. Disraeli's own candid opinion of Irish politics, though it is ascribed to Captain Bruges:—"I am not fond of Irish affairs; whatever may be said, and however plausible things may look, in an Irish business there is always a priest at the bottom of it. I hate priests. . . . An Irish business is a thing to be turned over several times." Here also, probably, is his own matured estimate of the grand cosmopolitan revolutionary agencies, though it is attributed to Mirandola: "'Garibaldi and Mary Anne,' said Captain Bruges. 'A Polchinello and a Bayadere,' exclaimed Mirandola."

A gentleman who has been, and who not impossibly may

again be Prime Minister of England, is, we take it, one of the natural trustees of the Queen's English. What does Mr. Disraeli mean then by charging his dukes and duchesses with using such words as "heart friend" and "brother friend?" The most egregious Americanism extant is at all events better rooted in the language than such wretched weeds of words as these. There is an Americanism, or, to be more exact, a Mormonism introduced in a very famous passage of the work, a passage which the critics with one voice proclaimed "idyllic," the scene in Lady Corisande's garden at the end of the last volume. It may be hypercritical, but the introduction of the word "seal," in that scene, seems to us to deprive it of its daintiness. It is only at Great Salt Lake City that the act of betrothal is described by the word "seal." To introduce it in the detail of an engagement between two persons of the very highest quality is an act of lese-noblesse. Much do we regret to see that Mr. Disraeli has fallen into the barbarous practice of translating the French "de," when used as a prefix of nobility, by the English word "of." He dedicates "Lothair" "with respect and affection" to "the Duke of Aumale"—a delicate compliment to a Catholic Prince. "Of" is not the equivalent of "de" in this particular use of the French particle. Its general use as such would lead to grotesque incongruities. For example, the Duc de Magenta is Marechal de MacMahon. Should the latter name be translated Marshal of MacMahon? It is possible to translate Duc de Broglie into Duke of Broglie, or Duc de Persigny into Duke of Persigny, as it is to translate Duc d'Aumale. But the French have a habit of dropping the distinctive title in speaking of people of rank, and may say, for example, "M. de Broglie" or "M. de Persigny" without impropriety. Are we to translate these too, and say Mr. of Broglie and Mr. of Persigny? And if not, why not? The "de" has precisely the same significance whether duc, comte, baron, or merely monsieur stands before it; and, if there be a rule in the matter, it ought to rule all through. To etymological experimentalists, eager to extend the authority of our prepositions, we would suggest that they should at all events commence with such English names and titles as contain the prefix. When we have become accustomed to speak of the Earl of Grey and Ripon, and the Earl of La Warr, of Lord of Mauley, Lord of Moleyns, Lord of Ros, and Lady of La Zouche, or, to be very correct, Lady of the Zouche—when our tongues have got used to say Sir John of Oyly, and Sir Henry of the Vœux, and Sir William of Bathe, and Mr. of the Cane, and, in fine, Lady Clara Vere of Vere, then it will be time enough to serve foreign names

after the same scurvy fashion. In regard to titles, it would be gratifying to all polite persons to know where Mr. Disraeli discovered that it is correct to address a Cardinal by the form "Sir." He assumed, we suppose, because it is the usage so to address an English Prince of the Blood, that the same rule holds regarding a Prince of the Church. But the rule is not merely not a rule of the Roman Court, it is the rule at no Court in Europe except that of St. James. Mr. Disraeli has the reputation of being a purist in punctilio. He may have hesitated to ask information from any of the earls who followed their countesses to Rome to such good advantage; but he might have consulted Shakespeare as to the way in which Henry the Eighth spoke to Wolsey. There is a slight but graceful feat of phrase in a passage describing one of those noble ladies. Lady St. Jerome, it is said, "was the daughter of a Protestant house; but during a residence at Rome, after her marriage, she had *reverted* to the ancient faith." We thank Mr. Disraeli for teaching us that word.

But the ancient faith has always had a spell for Mr. Disraeli; and its unity, its ubiquity, its perpetuity, its majestic patience, its manifold and unfathomable power, have, from early days, moved his imagination to wonder, and almost his heart to worship. In those old epic hours, when standing on the dusty plain which has swallowed the many-gated palace of Priam, he revolved the destinies of an age in which the instinct of ambition and the inspiration of power told him he was called to play a part that would belong to history if not to poetry—the vision of the sublime sovereignty which was founded on Calvary, whose annals connect the grand dead past of Asia with the living genius and energy of Europe, and whose sway still spreads day by day, like the glow of light, like the flow of tides, over lands and seas unknown to Socrates and Solomon,—in those rapt hours of his youth he thought of the Papacy, and he thought in numbers—

Lo ! as the universal Pontiff waves
His hand divine, and with celestial love
Serenely smiles, as from a gloomy tree,
Cypress severe, or melancholy yew,
Sally bright birds, or from a gloomier night
Stars brighter issue ; thus on staggering man,
Came Truth and Order with their welcome ray,
Prophetic of the warmer joys of dawn !
All sympathizing Rome ! a favoured child
Was Man when gazing on thy heavenly smile,
With gushing heart and eye of glistening dew,
A common parentage he fondly hailed !

Thy robe paternal grasping in his fears,
 And in his sorrow clinging to the breast
 That ever pardoned : parent, judge, and friend !
 Alike indulgent, with thy sacred rule,
 Returning Spring, with all its suavity,
 Mellowed the wintry heart of rugged man,
 Arts bloomed, and Learning budded ; softening Faith
 Burst like a balmy May-day with its sweets,
 And made all gentle as its odorous breeze,
 While on contending sceptres meekly dropped
 The Peace-compelling Crosier !

And even still the convocation of the Council—"the Parliament of men, the federation of the world," in a different sense from that of the poet, but in a higher, and truer, and in the only possible sense—affects and somewhat astonishes his imagination. The following passage is supposed to be the language of Cardinal Grandison, and we must admit the imitation of that stately and lucid style is in a high degree artistic :—

"An Œcumenical Council !" said Lothair.

"It is a weak phrase," resumed the Cardinal, "to say it will be the greatest event of this century. I believe it will be the greatest event since the Episcopate of S. Peter ; greater, in its consequences to the human race, than the fall of the Roman Empire, the pseudo-Reformation, or the Revolution of France. It is not much more than three hundred years since the last Œcumenical Council, the Council of Trent, and the world still vibrates with its decisions. But the Council of Trent, compared with the impending Council of the Vatican, will be as the mediæval world of Europe compared with the vast and complete globe which man has since discovered and mastered. . . . That alone will be a demonstration of power on the part of the Holy Father which no conqueror from Sesostri to Napoleon has ever equalled. It was only the bishops of Europe that assembled at Trent, and, inspired by the Holy Spirit, their decisions have governed man for more than three hundred years. But now the bishops of the whole world will assemble round the chair of S. Peter, and prove by their presence the catholic character of the Church. Asia will send its patriarchs and pontiffs, and America and Australia its prelates ; and at home, my dear young friend, the Council of the Vatican will offer a striking contrast to the Council of Trent ; Great Britain will be powerfully represented. The bishops of Ireland might have been counted on, but it is England also that will send her prelates now, and some of them will take no ordinary share in transactions that will give a new form and colour to human existence."

"Is it true, sir, that the object of the Council is to declare the infallibility of the Pope ?"

"In matters of faith and morals," said the Cardinal quickly. "There is no other infallibility. That is a secret with God. All that we can know of

the decision of the Council on this awful head is that its decision, inspired by the Holy Spirit, must infallibly be right. We must await that decision, and, when made known, we must embrace it, not only with obedience, but with the interior assent of mind and will. But there are other results of the Council on which we may speculate; and which, I believe, it will certainly accomplish:—first, it will show in a manner that cannot be mistaken that there is only one alternative for the human intellect: Rationalism or Faith; and, secondly, it will exhibit to the Christian powers the inevitable future they are now preparing for themselves."

It is true, and it is the bare truth. All roads lead to Rome, and on all the roads men march. There are nearly two hundred millions of the sons of Adam of every race, and tongue, and rank, and clime, who look to the throne of Peter with a reverence far beyond that which the tribes of Judah even owned to the sceptre of David. The very list of a Roman Congregation electrifies the fancy by the magnificent incongruity of the historical associations which it suggests, while it soothes the soul by the sense of world-wide unity of faith, and law, and baptism which it confirms. In that august catalogue Jerusalem and Chicago; Venice, Bombay, and Monte Video; Hebron, San Francisco, Peking, and Westminster; Vienna, Turin, Berlin, Paris, and Madrid; Brisbane, Pernambuco, Dromore, Hongkong, Arad, and Goa; Glasgow, Ghent, Kazan, Pesth, Amsterdam, Chili, Constantinople, revolve as in some marvellous kaleidoscope of infinite variety and exquisite unity. Every skin, every tongue, every clime, every order of society is represented there by men who have the aspect of sages or of saints, by men who counsel sovereigns in seats of oldest power, by men who challenge martyrdom at the hands of savages on desert frontiers. While the rulers of the world are levying men and borrowing money for a war which may bathe Europe in blood, this unique and august assembly proceeds in the name and by the power of the Holy Ghost to declare a hitherto unwritten law, the tradition of well-nigh twenty centuries, and so to consolidate and homage the authority of the Vicar of Christ in the front of a world incredulous, divided against itself, among whose children truths diminish, which is full of wars and rumours of war. In a few days more the great word will have gone forth from all the gates of Rome—from the hallowed lips of the Pontiff, who lives not in vain to the years of Peter, who bears not in vain, true conqueror by the Cross as he is, the symbol *Cruz de Cruce*. With it will spread, we may dare to hope, a great current of grace, and a great energy of faith among all the children of the Church; and in the heretical countries, Germany, America, Britain, even in the Protestant part of

Ireland, there will be a more zealous propagandism of God's whole truth; and in schismatic countries more eager efforts towards unity; and in heathen countries more missionaries and more martyrs. But meantime the voice of the world is for war, and the Imperial Eagles swoop towards the bastions of Ehrenbreitstein. How the duel of the two great military powers shall end, who but the God of battles can tell? The battalions are equally big and brave, the armament nicely balanced, the generals as valiant and as fortunate who serve the Hohenzollern as those who serve the Bonaparte. The German Empire may reappear; the French Empire may disappear. The Rhine may ripple upon the same and yet another soil at Coblenz, at Cologne, even at Rotterdam. A Prussian garrison at Paris may try again, and this time succeed, in blowing up the Pont de Jena. The Cossack may arrive at Constantinople; the Spanish flag reascend the keep of Gibraltar; Belgium vanish from the map, like Hanover; Italy burst, like a bomb-shell. But when the deluge of blood subsides, whoever and whatever be submerged, for certain, the Ark and the Dove of the Ark will reappear with the rainbow—reappear in augmented reverence and power, ancient of days, but young with the youth of the angels, the Servant of the Servants of Christ, but the King of the Kings of the earth.

ART. VIII.—THE LAND BILL AND THE LORDS.

A Bill to Amend the Law relating to the Occupation and Ownership of Land in Ireland. (Proposed and brought in by Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, and Mr. John Bright.) Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 15 February, 1870.

Lords' Amendments to the Irish Land Bill. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 8 July, 1870.

THE Irish Land Bill, at the moment that we write these lines, may be compared to some stout ship freighted with the fate of many men, which, after a difficult channel passage, sees morning break over a rising tide with the port of its destination full in view. It has passed many a treacherous shoal and sunken rock. It has weathered not a few gales of rough and contrary winds. It has had its spells of delusive calm. Once it was in imminent danger of sinking. Even

when it first saw land the coast was lined with the lamps of the wreckers. The helmsman's hand is still on the tiller, for it is not quite certain how many feet of water there are on the bar. But the voyage is, in truth, at an end; and after a few Custom House formalities the goodly cargo will be landed.

O navis, referent in mare te novi
Fluctus. O quid agis? Fortiter occupa
Portum.

When we last wrote on this subject, Mr. Gladstone, in a moment more like despair than any that we can remember in the course of his energetic and zealous career, had said that he feared it must remain for wiser and bolder men, in a more propitious time, to solve the great problem of the Irish Land. There was for some days a serious danger that the Bill would be withdrawn. And if it had been, it may be taken for certain that no English Government would venture to touch the topic for at least ten years to come. Because the danger to the Bill did not in reality proceed from the Opposition. Mr. Disraeli was evidently unfeignedly anxious to get it out of the way, notched and whittled, as far as possible, but not at the risk of utterly destroying its use. Dr. Ball, who took charge of the case of the Irish landlords with the same skilful zeal that he displayed in the case of the Irish Church Establishment last year, is a gentleman who, partly because he was a Liberal politician until very lately, partly because he has a good understanding and no small degree of tact, knows when a measure may be modified but must not be resisted, and how to set the drag of discretion at the right minute on the run-away gallop of the Irish Tories. But where would be the use of passing the Bill over whatever resistance or whatever concessions of the Opposition, if it were certain beforehand not to attain its true end; if, it were certain, that is to say, that it would not satisfy and pacify the Irish people? This for a time seemed to be an evident eventuality. All the signs were sinister. There was a great and sudden increase of agrarian crime. The language used at some public meetings, and in portions of the press, can only be compared to the whisky drugged with vitriol and bluestone, which is sold to the peasantry at country fairs, causing a perceptible increase of violence and insanity in the country. But even in graver regions the most deplorable fatuities were uttered, and put upon formal record. The Corporation of the City of Dublin actually passed a resolution, which they directed to the Prime Minister, to the effect that the position of the Irish tenant after the Bill had been passed would be rather worse than it was before. One of the Tenant Societies of Munster occupied

itself with the task of vilifying Mr. Moore during the last days of his upright life, because he had ventured earnestly and wisely to support the second reading of the Bill. The *Freeman's Journal*, the organ of Sir John Gray, the one recognized orthodox advocate of Catholic interests in the country, the widely-accepted vehicle of Irish Liberalism, the steady, consistent, and honoured supporter of Liberal Governments like Lord Palmerston's and Lord Russell's, of Governments which denounced tenant-right in every mood and tense, and declared they would sustain the Church Establishment while there was a plank of the Constitution left to stand on—this popular and pious oracle was praying Heaven to pity the country that was handed over to the mercy and wisdom of such Ministers as Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Fortescue.

But, happily, Heaven has shed not pity only but sense on a country not unloved of Heaven. There are fewer clouds in the Western sky than Sir Robert Peel saw there a generation ago; the wail of the ocean is not altogether so melancholy as it was, even when Mr. Disraeli last listened to it. The country grows calmer. Crime diminishes. Every tenant in Ireland is thinking, and thanking God in these days that the Land Question will be settled and well settled in a year in which the country has the prospect of a finer harvest than, perhaps, any other country in Europe. The first and the twelfth of July pass by in peace. The noisier and more rancorous elements of opinion seem to die away in vague sound, as ineffectual as the echoes in empty houses. A wiser, less time-serving, and more truth-loving, a manlier, simpler, and more candid public opinion is gradually forming in Ireland; and the study of the process is interesting. There are countries which, in certain conditions of the growth of the public character seem to cast up scum where others deposit lees. Ireland is one of those countries which sometimes flings its worst elements to the surface; but a shake sends them to the bottom, and the liquor is all the clearer and calmer for the process. The main elements of Irish society are sound, notwithstanding the amount of turbulence and flatulence at top. The nation is still, in the main, as a great thinker fancifully described it some fifteen years ago, "a pious peasantry patriarchally presided by a patriotic priesthood." But it has been one of the worst results of the bad state of its public life since the Famine that the country has been drained not merely of bone and sinew, but of soul and brain. Men of honour and of talent have found that the conditions of public life have become gradually intolerable to them. In other countries one generation advances on the line of another. But whatever

be the cause, it is not so in Ireland. It would be a cruel irony to compare the extant and the rising generation of Irish public men with their immediate predecessors, with the comrades of O'Connell, with the school of Young Ireland, with the founders of the Independent Party of 1852. "Woe is me, there are no heirs of their company," as the old Munster song says. It is, however, something to be able to say, towards the end of the session, that the Irish Land Bill has survived the sorties of Sir John Gray and the stampedes of Mr. Synan. Their achievements will, no doubt, be duly honoured by the compact array of the metropolitan press—and we shall be edified by Mr. Mac Birch and electrified by Mr. Mac Buncombe on the extent to which they have saved their country.

Sit laus plena, sit sonora,
Sit jucunda, sit decora.

The Land Bill will be law in a few days, and when it is the law of the land, what is it worth? That is, after all, the touchstone of the politics of the last year. "Its three pillars," as Mr. Gladstone called them, stand steady as the Galtees guarding the Golden Vale. Every Irish custom regarding land acquires the force of law. Every improvement made by the tenant, or those who held before him, becomes the property of the tenant. No tenant can be evicted without being compensated for his improvements in the first place; but, besides, for any consequential damage he may sustain by being turned out. To evict a tenant thus becomes a long, complicated, and expensive process. The Ulster Tenant Right, and every form of Tenant Right which has grown up outside of Ulster, comes at once within the pale of the law, and can be proved in Court by evidence in all its varieties, like a debt, or a trespass, or any other claim at law. More has really been done for the conservation of the Ulster Tenant Right than Mr. Sharman Crawford ever dreamed of proposing; and no one thought in his days of legalizing Tenant Right outside of Ulster. The two clauses which Mr. O'Connell drafted for the protection of the southern tenantry have been embraced in the Bill, and given the fullest force of which they are capable. The scheme which Mr. Gavan Duffy first suggested for the formation of a Peasant Proprietary stands part of the Bill—a fourth pillar, and perhaps the most solid and enduring of them all. We regret, and we cannot understand why, Mr. MacCarthy Downing should have insisted, when those clauses were considered, on the tenants finding one-third of the purchase-money instead of one-fourth, as the Government originally proposed; but, as we expected, when we wrote in April, the terms in regard

to repayment to the State have been considerably enlarged, and ten years hence, we have hardly a doubt, there will be many hundreds of men in Ireland who, thanks to these clauses, will know what it is to feel the just pride that belongs to a man who is the lord of his own land.

The ready and general acceptance of the principles of the Bill by the House of Lords, as testified in the debate on the Second Reading, was calculated to beget a false confidence in the wisdom and justice of the Upper House. Everything seemed to have been arranged beforehand for smooth despatch between Lord Granville and the Duke of Richmond; and the whole debate contrasted strangely with the volleys of religious zeal and party passion which accompanied the similar stage of the Irish Church Bill last year. So satisfied were even adepts in the ways of Parliament, after the opening speeches on the second reading, that the Land Bill would pass the Peers with hardly a change, that when Lord Dufferin delivered a lucid and elaborate argument, addressed essentially to those Conservative instincts of property of which the Peerage is the natural depository, his very colleagues seemed to feel that it was rather a waste of time and words. But the noble Lord estimated the difficulties ahead more wisely and truly. The one part of the Bill which then seemed to be in the gravest danger was the clauses enabling the formation of a Peasant Proprietary. We followed their fortunes with a peculiar interest, for we believe that they contain, in germ as it were, the future of Ireland, and that they will speedily come to mean, in a very true and solid sense, Ireland for the Irish. This part of the Bill Lord Dufferin so strengthened, by a passage of pleading masterly in its skill and foresight, that when Lord Salisbury, who began his speech in the cantankerous vein which afterwards characterized his conduct in Committee, nevertheless, led on apparently by the natural logical faculty of his mind, endorsed and further developed the same line of argument, it was clear this part of the Bill would go into Committee more strongly fortified than any other. It has passed through, with only one immaterial amendment. We have had occasion to differ from some of Lord Dufferin's views as to the true relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland; but we are bound to say now, as this great argument approaches its close, that in our belief hardly any living man has done so much to prepare English opinion for a large and generous settlement. He has done so, mainly because he always spoke as one who saw the two sides of the case, and whose natural attitude was that of a moderator between conflicting classes. If in some of his

public letters he seemed to lean to the side of the landlords, let it also be remembered that from his first speech in the House of Lords to his last, he has appeared there as the advocate of the tenant; and that when, in 1865, Lord Palmerston allowed Mr. Maguire's committee to be appointed, in order that Sir Robert Peel should get an opportunity of "eviscerating tenant right," he gave evidence hardly less valuable than Judge Longfield. Not many Liberal Peers in those days would so dare to gainsay the Premier's well-known dictum on the subject. We are bound to say so much because we feel that among many recent scandalous aberrations of public opinion in Ireland, hardly any has been more disgraceful than the calumnies which have been vented against this true nobleman, whose brilliant talents, humane heart, and manly and generous character are an honour to his country.

Before the Peers proceeded to consider the Bill in Committee an event had happened which, though personal in its character, elicited in Ireland a unanimous manifestation of national good will. The Prime Minister had advised the Queen to summon the Irish Chancellor to the Upper House by the title of Baron O'Hagan of Tullahogue. The O'Hagan of Tullahogue was of old the hereditary justiciary of Ulster; and Mr. Gladstone certainly contrived to touch two of the most sensitive chords of the Irish heart, its national pride and its religious zeal, when he summoned the first Roman Catholic Chancellor since the Battle of the Boyne to the House of Lords by the very title borne by the head of the clan who kept the custody of the Brehon Law in the days of the Celtic Princes. Irish Protestants, no less than Irish Catholics, felt and testified their satisfaction at the act of the Minister which thus set the broad seal of the State to a career, on many critical occasions distinguished, and in all its ways upright. But when Lord O'Hagan took his seat, the temper of the House of Lords had suddenly changed from what it was at the second reading. After the unnatural calm had followed a cyclone, and Lord Salisbury was riding the whirlwind and directing the storm, so far as storms of that sort are susceptible of direction. Lord Salisbury must live a great many years before it will be forgotten by his Peers, how he led them to produce that ridiculous tempest; and after what an amount of mere vague bluster, it had to return tamely to the cave of Eolus. Nothing that has occurred in its proceedings of late years was so calculated to lower the dignity and authority of the House. But all is well that ends well. Much of what was hurriedly done in Committee was as hurriedly undone on the Report, and the Act that will receive the Queen's signa-

ture before the end of this month will be in all, except some unessential details, the Bill passed by the House of Commons, and will, we trust, be, in very truth and deed, a substantial message of peace to Ireland.

It will be a message of peace in more than one point of view. Every Irishman of good will, who has watched the way that this question has made within the last year, must feel how much of its progress is due to the extraordinary zeal, industry, and ability with which so many Englishmen and Scotchmen devoted themselves to the study of its conditions. The astonishing Irish agitation of last autumn did not, we fear, much forward the cause it was intended to serve. Happily, the arguments that inform the minds and sway the councils of statesmen, were being otherwise provided by men who brought to the task an eager good-will, remarkable powers of detailed investigation, and, in some cases, a rare and intimate experience in systems of tenure. It is a curious and a gratifying fact that, as in the great struggle on the Church Question, the weight of the debate was borne by Englishmen—by Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, Mr. Lowe, the great mass of the majority also being English, for the difference between the Irish Liberal and Tory votes hardly represented a dozen; so when the Land Question came to be studied—and it is a question that has advanced through sheer study—they were Scotchmen who took up the task most promptly and effectively. Mr. Campbell's book and his pamphlet penetrated the whole case with an informed light, that made every man who read what he said, at once master of the great issues of the subject. The writings of Mr. Caird, Mr. MacLagan, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Leslie, Mr. M'Combie, Colonel Muir, from many divers points of view, urging different conclusions, but all uniting in a strong sympathy for the case of the people involved, and all conducting their investigations with the diligent but cautious patience which belongs to their country, threw, we say, the weight of Scotch intellect and Scotch feeling on the side of Ireland in a way that we are proud and happy to have an opportunity of acknowledging. The English press, almost without exception, devoted itself to prepare the data, which should commend the comprehensive settlement which the Government had promised to the public opinion, not of the empire merely, but of the world—for the state of Ireland had long been a question of world-wide interest. The *Times*, in particular, had amends to make, and it made them nobly. The editor was fortunate in choosing for his Special Commissioner an Irishman in every conceivable way qualified, Mr. O'Connor Morris, the result of whose labours is a book which

will live long beyond its occasion, and be cited as an historical authority, not less valuable but more, than the similar, but not so detailed or scholarly studies, which Arthur Young made of the state of Ireland exactly a hundred years ago. The volume of studies on tenure which the Cobden Club caused to be prepared, is another example of a whole class of profound and accurate investigations, which fortified a case which had, as it were, to go, like a wedge, through a mass of old-established opinion. Among the contributions of Irish research, of which, at another time, we may notice the principal, the book of Mr. John George MacCarthy, of Cork, deserves high praise for its accurate and clearly expressed knowledge of certain aspects of the subject, and, we need hardly add, for the easy eloquence with which it enforces conclusions, with which we could not, however, always see our way to an agreement.

Lord Russell, in the peroration of his speech on the second reading of the Land Bill in the Lords, eloquently congratulated the Premier that he had lived to achieve the task in which so many great statesmen had so signally failed. It is seldom in human history that a government has had the opportunity of giving to a nation a statute such as that which now bears the names of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Fortescue, and which in a few days will bear the name of Queen Victoria. The intense and sustained toil which its passage through Parliament involved, has not been lightened by the manly and persuasive eloquence and the large-hearted humanity of Mr. Bright. But it had the constant and eager service of every quality that is combined in Mr. Gladstone's character and genius; and the minister in whose especial charge it was, Mr. Fortescue, brought to its conduct a constant zeal, a thorough knowledge, and the blended tact and energy which is the mental habit of a true statesman. When this Act has passed, it will at once bring the magic sense of property and the sanction of just and paternal law home to the hearths of six hundred thousand men, the bone and sinew, the true constituent force of the Irish nation. That nation has its faults, like all the children of Adam, but it is a nation of magnanimous generosity and candour, as well as of patient charity and hopeful faith. It has hoped and waited long, and in the hour when God has at last heard its prayer, it will not be ungrateful to the men whom He designed to repair the wrongs of centuries, to free its ancient church, and to give its sons the sure possession of the soil of their own country. Blessed are the peacemakers—thrice blessed they whom the voice of a long-suffering nation salutes by that august and consecrated name.

ART. IX.—THE COUNCIL

Constitutio Dogmatica de Fide Catholica.

WE purpose in the following article to treat briefly three different questions; which have no other relation with each other, except as being more or less connected with the Vatican Council. We will begin with considering its first Dogmatic Constitution; secondly, we will confront the allegation, so assiduously put forth by disloyal Catholics, that the moral unanimity of the Bishops present is required for the infallible dogmatic definition of an Œcumenical Council; and thirdly, we will say a few words on a proposition laid down by one or two eminent writers, as regards a certain alleged note of an ex cathedrâ Pontifical Act.

I.

The first Dogmatic Constitution of the Vatican Council has so much importance, and in so many different ways, that it would well repay a most full and careful treatment: whereas circumstances compel us to attempt nothing more than the merest skeleton outline, of what we so much wish we could urge connectedly and at length. We will only therefore throw out a few hints of what we would say: and we must beg our readers to take the trouble, which would legitimately devolve on ourselves, of working those hints into a connected whole.

We will begin with referring to the form and circumstances of the Constitution, and afterwards comment on its substance.

1. It is remarkable how uniformly it implies the dogma of Pontifical Infallibility. According to the precedent set by all Councils over which the Supreme Pontiff has presided in person,—in its form it issues from the Pontiff alone: the Council purporting to have no other office, than that of concurring with his Definition. “*From this Chair of Peter, in the sight of all, we resolve to profess and declare the salutary doctrine of Christ*”; “while the Bishops of the whole world, who have been collected in the Holy Ghost by our authority into Œcumenical Council, sit and pronounce judgment in company with ourselves.” Then observe the preceding sentence,—“We have never ceased to reprobate [these] perverse doctrines in accordance with our supreme Apostolic Office.” And finally Pius IX. “proscribes and condemns” the “errors

opposed" to the Council's teaching, "by the power given to HIM by God."* It will be evident to any one who reads carefully the whole paragraph, that the present Constitution is spoken of by Pius IX. as in no respect more *final and peremptory* than his former judgments; but as only differing from them, in regard to its greater *emphasis and solemnity of promulgation*.

Particular attention should also be paid to the sentence, which concludes the whole Constitution. It is essential, the Council declares, that "all those errors be diligently shunned, which approach more or less to heresy"; and the assembled Bishops "admonish" all Catholics therefore of their obligation, "to observe the Constitutions and Decrees, whereby such evil opinions have been proscribed by the Holy See." The Council therefore proclaims an obligation, as incumbent on all Catholics, of yielding intellectual submission to those Constitutions of the Holy See, which condemn errors that are short of heresy. In other words, as we should be prepared to argue, the Council has virtually declared that the Holy See is infallible in such Constitutions.

2. The second inference which we would draw from the Constitution "*Dei Filius*," refers to the *great multitude* of Pius IX.'s *ex cathedrâ* judgments. Some Catholics really seem to speak, as though he had never defined *ex cathedrâ* any verity except the Immaculate Conception. On the contrary, he expressly declares that he has "*never ceased*" (*nunquam intermisimus*) from condemning *ex cathedrâ* "perverse doctrines"; and he had made, as our readers will remember, an entirely similar declaration in the "*Quantâ curâ*." If for more than twenty-three years he has never ceased from such condemnations, the number of his *ex cathedrâ* Acts must by this time be very considerable.

3. The third inference which we may fairly derive from this first Constitution of the Vatican Council, is against the allegation of various persons, who have criticised this REVIEW in one important particular. We have maintained from time to time, that very serious doctrinal errors are often advocated by writers who have not actually ceased to be Catholics; and that it is a great duty to protest against such errors. Certain persons, for whom personally we entertain the highest respect, have been of opinion that such criticism is most undesirable; as tending to foster division among Catholics, and to generate other serious evils. But the Vatican Council declares, that "*many* (*plures*) from among the children of the Catholic Church have erred from the path of true piety"; that among them "the Catholic sense has been weakened"; that they have been "led away by various foreign doctrines"; and, finally, that they

* "*Potestate nobis a Deo traditâ.*" Cf. "*Nos inhærentes prædecessorum nostrorum vestigiis.*"

"have depraved the genuine sense of dogma, as held and taught by Holy Mother Church."*

4. We are next to consider the doctrinal teaching of the Definition. Before the Public Session of Low Sunday, various Protestants and disaffected Catholics had alleged, with that assumption of exclusive information which is so characteristic of the class, that its wording had been so extraordinarily modified and softened down, in deference to episcopal objections, as to leave hardly any definite scope whatever. Its publication has apparently put to shame these otherwise shameless critics; for they have not ventured, since that event, to repeat their calumny. Certainly nothing can be more straightforward and pertinent, than the lessons which the assembled bishops have conveyed in this their first utterance.

Its direct purpose is to set forth those dogmata of the Catholic Faith, which are denied or jeopardized by that philosophy of "naturalism or rationalism," which is the fundamental speculative evil of the time. In other words, the Constitution condemns certain tenets, bearing on the above-named head, which are directly contradictory to the Faith. As to those errors on the subject, which are pregnant indeed with *danger* to the Deposit without actually *contradicting* it, the Council is silent; referring Catholics (as we have just seen) to the various infallible condemnations of those errors, which have already been issued by the Holy See.

5. Firstly, then, comes the head, "On God the Creator of all things." The Council is obliged, by the atheism and pantheism of the day, to define expressly, that there is One Self-existent God, infinite in all perfections, ineffably exalted above all other conceivable beings, essentially and absolutely distinct from the world. The Council further defines, that this God most freely called creatures into existence out of nothingness—not as deriving from them any kind of increase to His beatitude and perfection, which would be impossible—but as desiring to manifest through them His essential attributes. Lastly, that He interposes unceasingly by His providence in the events of that world which He has created; and particularly, that even the free actions of rational beings are objects of His prevision.

6. The second Chapter is entitled "On Revelation." It begins with laying down, that God can be certainly known, altogether apart from revelation of any kind, by the natural light of human reason; and the corresponding canon solemnly anathematizes those who deny this verity. The extreme French traditionalism, which

* The "Civiltà Cattolica" does not hesitate to say, "that the Liberal Catholics, whether they are in good or in bad faith, prove themselves in these days more injurious to the cause of God than the sworn enemies of Christianity. This is a severe truth, but a truth it is." (June 4th, page 534.)

began with Lamennais but by no means ended with him, has now therefore received a final and a fatal blow.

The Bishops proceed however to declare that, even as regards God's Existence and the other doctrines of natural religion, Revelation does most important service "in the present condition of mankind"; viz., by securing that these truths "shall be able to be known by all men readily, with firm certitude, and without the admixture of any error."

It is not in this respect however—so the Council continues—that Revelation can be accounted *absolutely necessary*; but it is most strictly and absolutely necessary, in order that men may reach their *supernatural* end. God has most freely raised men to "a participation of divine blessings," the existence of which could never have been discovered by unaided reason, and which, nevertheless (by God's appointment), men must know in order to enjoy. Revelation therefore is absolutely and strictly necessary, for men's attainment of their supernatural end.

7. The Bishops next—following the Council of Trent—declare that the authentic utterances of Revelation are contained in the Word of God, written and unwritten, as handed down from Apostolic times. They are thus led to set forth some important doctrine concerning Holy Scripture.

Firstly. It is not sufficient to say that the Books of Scripture "contain Revelation without any error": it is further necessary to hold, that "they have God for their author, as having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost"; and that they have been delivered to the Church herself, as possessing that quality. This statement contains a condemnation of the doctrine, ascribed by many to Lessius and Du Hamel, which the Constitution mentions in an earlier clause of the sentence. This doctrine is, that a book of purely human origin may become canonical Scripture, if the Church should subsequently declare it entirely free from error and otherwise worthy to be so accounted.

Secondly. The assembled Bishops clear up a misapprehension which has arisen, concerning the Tridentine decree on the interpretation of Scripture. We are not sure that we rightly understand the words of their Decree in this particular; and we have found some difference of opinion on the subject among learned Catholics. Circumstances prevent us from duly investigating the matter, and we therefore pass on.

8. The next chapter is on Faith, and contains a most luminous exposition of the Catholic doctrine on that virtue. In an act of Faith, the Catholic, assisted by supernatural grace, accepts revealed truth, not on the ground of its intrinsic credibility, but exclusively on the authority of God its Revealer. On the other hand, in addition to the aids of grace, God has given other assistances towards belief—external evidences of various kinds, miracles, pro-

phacies, and the like: "most certain signs of Divine Revelation, and accommodated to the understanding of all." Yet no supernatural act of Faith can be elicited, without "the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Ghost." Faith, even divorced from charity, is God's gift, and tends towards salvation; indeed, without some act of Faith, no single adult can possibly arrive at justification and eternal life. Catholics, moreover, have an inappreciable advantage in respect to Faith over all other Christians. For, firstly, the Church herself, from her singular combination of endowments, is "a mighty and perpetual motive of credibility, and an irrefragable witness to her own divine legation." "As a sign raised aloft in sight of the nations, she invites to herself those who have not yet believed; and she gives also ground of certainty to her children, that the Faith which they profess rests on a most firm foundation." Moreover, secondly, God gives, by a particular providence, a special illumination to the children of the Church, so that they can never lose the light of Faith, except by their own grievous sin. See especially Canon 6.—"If any one shall say that the faithful are in a like condition with those who have not yet come to that Faith which alone is true—so that Catholics can possibly have a just cause of suspending their assent to that Faith which they have already received under the Church's magisterium until they have gone through a scientific demonstration of the credibility and truth of their Faith—let him be anathema." At the same time we should add that, as it seems to us, the case is abundantly possible—perhaps not infrequent—of a person fancying himself a convert to Catholicity, who has in real truth never accepted the Church's authority with divine faith. Such a man's defection is no real apostasy, and does not therefore, perhaps, fall under the words of the Canon.

9. An incidental declaration in this chapter is worthy of especial attention. "All those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic Faith, which are contained in Scripture or Tradition; and which are proposed to belief by the Church as divinely revealed, *whether by her solemn judgment or by her ordinary and universal magisterium.*" Incredible as it must appear, some Catholics have been found to maintain, that no truths are to be believed *de fide* Catholicâ, except those which the Church may have *expressly defined*. But the Vatican Council infallibly decrees, that the Church's ordinary and universal magisterium is no less sufficient foundation for a dogma of the Catholic Faith, than is her solemn judgment.

10. The fourth and last chapter is on Faith and Reason. There are two classes of known truths—the natural and supernatural—differing from each other both in principle and in object: in principle, because the former is known by Reason and the latter by Faith; and in object, because the former is entirely within, and the

latter mostly external to, the sphere of unaided Reason. Reason indeed can exercise most important service within the domain of Revelation; nevertheless, even after Revelation has been given, Reason can never in this life demonstrate the *truth* of revealed verities. Yet Faith and Reason can of course never be at variance with each other. Whenever such variance appears on the surface, the cause must either be, that dogma is apprehended falsely, *i. e.* in some sense different from the Church's; or else, that private fancies have been mistaken for the dictates of Reason. Whenever therefore any proposition, which contradicts the Faith, is presented to Catholics as a conclusion of science,—they are strictly bound to reject it, as being, even in the order of secular science, erroneous or at least unfounded.

Reason and Faith, we have said, can never be at real variance with each other; but more than this is true, for they are of great mutual assistance. On the one hand, Reason has been the one effective instrument of all theological science; while, on the other hand, Faith preserves Reason from many errors and imparts to it multiform knowledge.

Lastly. The Deposit of Faith is no philosophical discovery, to be perfected by subsequent human speculation; but has been given the Church once for all, to be faithfully guarded and infallibly declared. Yet undoubtedly the Faith, once for all given by the Apostles, admits (as time proceeds) of being more profoundly apprehended, and more thoroughly mastered in its mutual relations. This is the doctrine of "Development": to which Father Newman drew such prominent attention even before he was a Catholic, and which the Vatican Council now has so distinctly sanctioned and enforced.

11. After thus setting forth Catholic truth—positively in the Chapters and negatively in the Canons—Pius IX. founds, on what has preceded, a practical exhortation. He addresses himself to "all Christ's faithful, but especially those who govern or perform the office of teaching." He "entreats them by the mercy of Jesus Christ,—nay, commands them by the authority of their God and Saviour,"—that they will use their utmost efforts to extirpate such errors. It is not unworthy of observation, that *all* Christ's faithful are exhorted by the Council to labour actively, as opportunity may serve, towards the overthrow of theological error: though this duty is of course more *especially* incumbent on those, who are invested with the office of teaching.

In conclusion comes that most important sentence, to which we have already referred. The present Constitution, as we have more than once pointed out, condemns no other errors, except those which actually *contradict* revealed dogmata: but "it is not enough," adds the Holy Father with full approbation of the Council, "it is

not enough to avoid *heretical pravity*, unless those errors also are diligently shunned which more or less nearly *approach* thereto." The words are spoken generally; but in this case they have of course special reference to errors connected with those particular doctrines which the Constitution has laid down. In regard to such non-heretical errors, the faithful are earnestly referred by Pope and Council to the various condemnatory Acts which have issued from the Holy Sec. To this class should be referred such tenets, as many of those denounced in the Munich Brief, and again in the censure of Günther. The modified Traditionalism, recently advocated at Louvain, will also come in the same category; and such ontologicistic errors also, as were condemned in the Letters addressed from Rome to the four Louvain Professors. It must never be forgotten that these Professors were expressly required, not to obey these Letters as disciplinary enactments, but to subject their intellect to them "*fully, perfectly, and absolutely*," as to doctrinal instructions.

Such then is this first Dogmatic Constitution of the Vatican Council: commencing, as we earnestly trust, a long series of doctrinal definitions, which shall bring loyally-intentioned Catholics into far greater intellectual union than now unhappily exists; and which shall thus increase a hundred fold their power of combining in resistance against the moral and intellectual evils of the time.

II.

An apparent variety has at last been introduced into the discussion of Papal infallibility. Mgr. Maret, "from the bosom of the old Sorbonne," had given a new edition of the famous "*Defensio*." He brought to the support of an untenable cause, learning, controversial acumen, and a lucid style. Janus — from "liberal-Catholic" Munich—had poured out the vials of his wrath upon the devoted heads of the Romanizers. He brought to his work of destruction a crude mass of chips and cuttings, unbounded hardihood, and a not-misplaced reliance on ignorance and bigotry. Döllinger and Gratry had condensed into pamphlets the *virus* of Gallicanism and Liberalism for the behoof of those who have not patience to read octavos, or even to skim lightly over the pages of a duodecimo. In a host of pamphlets, articles, letters, in Italy, Germany, France, and at home, the old song had been repeated with variations. At length, it became plain that the orbis Catholicus would be moved from its resolve, neither by the time-honoured traditions of Paris, nor the insolent swagger of young Germany. Then the tactics were changed. The plan of direct attack on the doctrine, or the opportuneness of defining it, was abandoned, and it was sought to shelve the question by a side-wind. An ingenious

expedient was devised for this purpose. The theory was started, and pressed forward into sudden prominence, that a majority of the Council would not be competent to decide points of faith, but only a morally unanimous consent of the Fathers. The opposition outside the Council must be congratulated upon the cleverness of this move. In the first place, it is a diversion, and anything that may put off the catastrophe is a matter of triumph. Besides, it has the merit of seeming to bring new matter into the controversy. There is a scientific, abstract, general air about the proposition, making it look as if it had no immediate reference to a controversy of the hour.

The "Civiltà Cattolica" has devoted two articles to the subject. The first is a general discussion of the question, and critique of the various arguments alleged by the liberal journals in support of their view. The second is a rejoinder to a pamphlet published at Paris in reply to the first article.* We shall not enter into the particular controversy of the Roman periodical. It is well able to take care of itself, and to give a good account of its antagonists. But, in the few observations we intend to make, we shall take the liberty of drawing on its pages as occasion may serve.

We will begin by stating our conviction that from the point of view of reason, the controversy between the defenders and the impugnors of Papal infallibility could not have taken a form better calculated than the present to put the true doctrine in its full force and light. From the discussion of the mutual relations of majorities and minorities in councils, the guiding and all-controlling power of the Supreme Pontiff will be made evident; while the doubts and fears which have arisen in many minds, as if the relations of the Pope to the Episcopate were about to be fundamentally changed by the proposed definition, will be calmed at least, if not entirely set at rest.† For ourselves, we have no doubt that a fair considera-

* L'Unanimité dans les Conciles Œcuméniques. Paris: E. Dentu. 1870.

† We have no desire to enter into a small verbal controversy which excited some notice two or three months ago. But we think that many excellent persons are needlessly scared by the use of the terms—*personal, independent, separate*, as applied to Pontifical Infallibility. The use of each of these words is right in one sense and wrong in another. The word *personal* is rightly used to set aside the distinction of *sedes* and *sedens*; a wrong use is to take it as signifying that the soul of an individual, on election to the Popedom, receives a new supernatural quality different from that of ordinary mortals. It rightly insinuates also that the prerogative of infallibility is incommunicable. The term *independent* rightly excludes the subordination of the Pope to the rest of the Episcopate, and expresses the true order in which the divine charisma of infallibility is derived to the Church; it is wrongly understood to mean that the Pope has no obligations to the *loci theologici*, as if, of his own good pleasure, without taking any means of ascertaining what had been revealed by Almighty

tion of this question of unanimity will result in these two conclusions.

First, that the novelty of this question, in the present controversy, is only apparent; since to ask for unanimity, as a condition of a legitimate definition of faith is no more nor less than to assert, under another form of words, that the infallibility of the Church resides in the consent of the Churches, in the sense of the fourth Proposition of the Gallican Declaration, and by consequence to deny infallibility to the Church of Rome.* The author of the *Defensio* draws out the whole theory in strictly logical accord with his first principles. Starting from the denial of Papal inerrancy, he places the sole and unfailing test of ecclesiastical infallibility in the consent of the Churches, whether assembled in Council or dispersed throughout the *orbis terrarum*. And, since all the Churches, taken singly, are liable to error, their testimony, to

God, he could propose new articles of faith or rules of moral conduct. So the word *separate* (which we should not think of using ourselves, nor are we sure that it has been used on the Ultramontane side of the controversy, though it has been ascribed to them by their adversaries): the word *separate* is capable of a right and a wrong sense. If it be understood to mean that the Holy Father, in defining this or that dogma, is not bound to consult formally the rest of the Episcopate, either antecedently, concomitantly, or subsequently, it is most true; but if by *separate* is meant that the Pope, considered as cut off from, or in opposition to the rest of the Episcopate, is an infallible guide of faith, such a sense is inadmissible, because the case is impossible. Should any of our readers think these and such like explanations superfluous or too late, we would ask them if it is not true that a good deal of heat in the present controversy arises from the fact that the parties to the dispute have not always rightly apprehended their opponents' meaning,—a thing by no means to be wondered at when one considers the fragmentary character of newspaper controversy.

We are glad to be able to confirm our observations in this note by the authority of the Archbishop of Cambrai. The thought and language are so like our own, that we must say that the passage had not come under our notice until after the note was written. In a recent letter to the clergy of his diocese, Mgr. Regnier writes:—"Dites que ce Pape isolé, absolu, séparé de l'Eglise sur laquelle il exercerait un empire despotique; ce Pape multipliant à son gré les dogmes nouveaux, décidant, définissant tout ce qu'il veut sur toutes choses, sans autre règle et sans autre mesure que son bon plaisir, est une création chimérique de l'esprit de parti. Le vrai Pape, celui dont nous acceptons avec amour et sans restriction l'enseignement irréformable et l'autorité suprême, ne peut jamais être séparé de l'Eglise universelle."—*Lettre de Mgr. l'Archevêque de Cambrai sur le Concile Œcuménique du Vatican. Bien Public, 31 Mai, 1870.* This letter has since been published in the form of a pamphlet by M. Palme.

* "In fidei quoque quæstionibus præcipuas Summi Pontificis esse partes, ejusque decreta ad omnes et singulas Ecclesias pertinere, nec tamen irreformabile esse judicium, nisi Ecclesiæ consensus accesserit."—*Denzinger, Enchir.*, n. 1191., ed. 4. It is immaterial whether we say the consent of the "Church" or the "Churches," since the author of the *Defensio* uses the expressions indiscriminately.—*Vide passim.*

have dogmatic effect, must be unanimous. *A fortiori*, therefore, those Bishops who happen to be present at a given Ecumenical Council, must be unanimous. And, always in complete harmony with himself, the doctor of Gallicanism refuses to allow infallibility to the unanimous definition of a General Council, until the decision has been accepted, expressly or tacitly, by the unrepresented Churches. But, as it would not have suited the tactics of the neo-Gallicans to have taken their stand upon the fourth Proposition, because in that case they well knew the verdict of public opinion would have condemned them without further hearing, they have treated the question of unanimity by itself and on its own merits, as if it were not a mere corollary of an erroneous theory of Church authority.

Secondly, it will appear that the prime source and seat of the infallibility of the Catholic Church is the Pope of Rome for the time being, and none other. For it will not only be seen that complete agreement among the Bishops is not a necessary condition of an infallible decision, but, which is much more important, it will be clear as the sun at noon-day, that the definitive power of an Ecumenical Council is derived in the last resort from its union with the Roman Pontiff and the conformity of its judgment with his. It will be seen that majorities and minorities *per se* are of small account. No majority, as such, has power to bind the consciences of men. Any minority, in communion with the Pope, is sufficient to command assent.

The first thing to be done, in order to place the truth of these assertions in a proper position to be seen, is to remove the ambiguity which surrounds the inquiry. At first sight it would seem as if few questions could be simpler in their terms than this. In Ecumenical Councils is a majority of votes sufficient to carry a question; or is unanimity, at least moral, necessary? And yet almost every term must be distinguished and limited before we can properly understand its bearing. As we are not writing a treatise on Councils, but only offering a small contribution to a question of the day, we have no intention of opening out and examining all the ramifications of the above question. We shall indicate so much as may be necessary to enable us to answer with special reference to the discussion on the subject of Infallibility.

Let us then analyze the question. Ecumenical Councils, speaking from our present point of view, are of two sorts. In some the Pontiff sits in person; in others he is represented by legates. When present he sits in a double capacity of President and of Prince.* He has this double character, because although the church is a monarchy, the Bishops in Council are not simply consultors and

* Bellar., De Conc. et Eccles., lib. i. cap. 18, n. 16.

advisers of his Holiness, but real judges of the faith. But as the Pope can never, and least of all in a definition of faith, divest himself of his character of Prince, it is unnecessary for us to discuss his relations to the Council in quality of President. When represented by legates he may take no further part than to confirm whatever true and just decrees may be voted by the Council, or he may from a distance direct the whole course of procedure so that no subject shall be introduced except from his initiative. Further, an Œcumenical Council may be considered before or after the Pope's judgment is known. In the one case the Bishops would be completely independent in voting; in the other their votes, on a question of doctrine, could be no more than a solemn approbation, confirmation, and promulgation of the Papal decision. Does the question refer to all these cases, or to some only, and which of them?

Again the term "moral unanimity" is vague. What fraction destroys it, and what may be overlooked? Are the votes to be counted or weighed? And if weighed, by what standard?

Once more, is the question asked of all subjects that may come before a General Council, or only of matters of faith, or in fine of the one point of Papal Infallibility only? Finally, is the theory confined to doctrinal decrees, or does it extend to disciplinary decrees also?

It will have been seen that a great deal more is contained in the above question than appears at first sight, and that a wide door is opened to interminable controversy. It is in order to avoid any such catastrophe that we have spent so many words in expanding the sense of the question. For the same reason we shall confine the inquiry to matters of faith, including, of course, the particular question of Papal Infallibility. For that point can be excluded only on the heretical ground which Döllinger has taken up, namely, that in such a case the Pope would be judge in his own cause. Moreover, we shall speak of the Pope as taking an actual part in the Council, either by word of mouth if present, or by writing if absent. Further, we shall exclude, without argument, all such distinctions and suppositions as depend upon an heretical principle. Thus, for instance, we shall consider the vote of the most obscure Vicar-Apostolic precisely equal to that of a Cardinal Archbishop of Paris or Vienna, in a definition of faith, for the simple reason that all and only Bishops, as such, are of the *Ecclesia Docens*. To imply a representative character in Bishops, in the sense that their voices are to be weighed by the population and civilization of their dioceses, is the same as saying that the laity are judges of faith, which is a Jansenist heresy.*

* We have more than once called attention in this Review to the fact that this heresy is still prevalent. The Munich school, with all its belong-

We are now in a position to answer in brief the question before us. In order to make the argument as clear and comprehensive as possible, we will suppose an extreme instance in illustration. Let us take the case of an Ecumenical Council, at which the bishops of the Universal Church, with few exceptions, are present; *e.g.* take the Vatican Council as an example, adding about one hundred and fifty to the actual number of Fathers. Let us suppose a division on a point of faith which imperatively demands solution. Let us further suppose that one side gains a bare majority of votes. The hypothesis is perfectly possible, at least in the abstract, because Almighty God has not promised indefectibility in the faith to one-half the Church rather than to the other. As the Bishop of Orleans wrote some time ago, though in a different connection, the church is indefectible, but France and Spain and Portugal have no guarantee that the faith will be preserved within their borders any more than in the East, and Germany, and England.* In such a case then neither party would be bound to yield. Not the majority, as will be readily admitted by Gallicans. Not the minority, because the promises were not made to a majority as such. But place the Pope on the side of the majority, and what happens? According to theologians and canonists of all schools, the Council may proceed to a definition; the minority is bound to go over to the side of the majority; and the decision is definitively and legally binding on all Catholics. Therefore, on principles recognized by Gallicans, as by the rest of the *Schola*, a case is perfectly conceivable in which the consent of the Churches is not necessary to the legitimate definition and promulgation of an article of faith. But in the case

ings, is impregnated with its poison. It lies at the root of Catholic Liberalism in all its branches. In our last number (p. 306) we gave reasons for regarding this tenet as strictly heretical, but we may also cite the condemned proposition of the Synod of Pistoja:—"Propositio quæ statuit, potestatem a Deo datam Ecclesiæ, ut communicaretur pastoribus, qui sunt ejus ministri pro salute animarum; sic intellecta, ut a *communitate fidelium in pastores derivetur ecclesiastici ministerii ac regiminis potestas: hæretica.*"—Prop. 2da inter Pistorien. damnatas a Pio VI. per Constit.: *Auctorem Fidei*, apud Denzinger. Enchir., n. 365, ed. 4. It will be objected perhaps that the teaching power of the Church is not included in the proposition as it stands, and that we are therefore unwarrantably extending the force of the qualification. But it does not seem to us, speaking under correction, that the objection can be sustained. In a dogmatic definition two things are to be distinguished. For such a definition is not only infallibly true, but must be believed by all as infallibly true. Now this obligation of belief does not arise, strictly speaking, from the infallibility of the decision, but from the Church's mission to teach the whole world, together with the corresponding obligation on the part of mankind of listening to her voice. That is, a definition of faith is an act of jurisdiction, and therefore comes under the term *regimen*.

* We are referring from memory to a passage of the eloquent Bishop's second letter to Mgr. Dechamps.

supposed, the consent of the Churches is the same thing as unanimity among the Fathers, since all the Churches are represented. And if no account is taken of a minority of Bishops actually present, and exercising their office of judges, much less would there be any waiting for the adhesion of unrepresented churches. *A fortiori* therefore, in councils in which a part only of the Episcopate sat, unanimity would not be required, because it would always be presumed that the unrepresented Churches were on the side of the Pope.

And now we are arrived at a point where we may see, as by a sort of revelation, the utter baselessness of the Gallican theory. The more moderate Gallicans, like Tournely, admit the Pope's right, in the case supposed, to vote with the majority or minority, as he pleases. Not only so, but they admit further that, in the case of his voting with the minority, the majority is bound to go over to his side, which is most true, though it is not for us to reconcile it with the Fourth Article of the Declaration. Natalis Alexander supposes the case of a Pope sending his decision on a controverted point of faith to a General Council, and teaches, *totidem verbis*, that the sounder part of the Council, and therefore the one which commands the obedience of the faithful, is that which adheres to the Pope's judgment, no regard being had to the relative numbers of the dissentients.* And Tournely speaks in the same sense, except that his words are general, and refer directly to the Bishops dispersed. But this circumstance does not weaken the force of his testimony, since, as we have already seen, genuine Gallicanism knows of no distinction between the rights, in matters of faith, of Bishops dispersed and assembled in Council. Tournely puts the crucial case which is fatal to his own teaching. He supposes a division among the Bishops, in such sort that several (*plures*) are on one side with the Roman Pontiff, and several (*plures*) on the other side without the Pope; and he has no doubt (*haud dubie*) that the side must be followed which is united with the head.

* Si enim Episcoporum major aut sanior pars (sanior autem est, quæ Ecclesiæ Romanæ ceterarum Matri et Magistræ et Summo Pontifici, Christianorum omnium Patri et Doctori, fidei depositum tuenti adhæret) illius definitionem ac sententiam, ut ore S. Petri prolatam receperit, nemini Catholice sentienti debet esse dubium quin Romanus Pontifex in ea ferenda Fidei regulas secutus sit, cum errare non possit Ecclesia, quæ est columna et firmamentum veritatis.—*Nat. Alex. Hist. Eccles. Sæc. VII.*, dissert. ii., prop. 2. Cfr. Tournely de Ecclesia, tom. ii., qu. v., art. 3, p. 163.

It is hardly necessary to call the reader's attention to the circular reasoning of the Gallican theologian. The faithful are assured that the Pope has made no mistake if the sounder part of the Episcopate agree with him. They must not, however, forget that the sounder part of the Episcopate is precisely that which adheres to him! In justice to Natalis Alexander, it ought to be said that the circle is not his own, but essentially involved in the system he was defending.

Now what is the value of these admissions, if we are to call them admissions, and not rather direct teaching, of Natalis and Tournely? Such language is nothing less than an equivalent assertion of the Ultramontane doctrine. If, in such a division, the Pope is bound to follow neither side, and if all are bound to follow the side which he elects, what is this but to say that, in the last resort, the infallibility of the Church has its root and fixed abode in him, and in him without subordination to his brethren in the Episcopate? But Mgr. Maret, who lives in an age of parliamentary government, maintains that the Pope is bound to adhere to a certain large majority; nay, that if necessary, he may be coerced into adhesion. In point of consistency this doctrine is no more in harmony with the fundamental principle of Gallicanism than the former opinion. But that is a small matter compared with the portentous conclusions it involves.

Let us turn once more to our supposed case. All the Fathers of the Council have voted freely, each according to his conscience. There is a large majority on one side. To this the Pope is called upon to adhere, *volens nolens*, with the choice of deposition if he refuses. We are not misrepresenting the Bishop of Sura. He teaches that a large conciliar majority forces to its side, of right, the Pope and the minority. And so it has come to this, that whereas the meanest bishop of Christendom has at least a free judicial voice, the chief bishop is to have none; whereas by the fourth Gallican article, the judgment of the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith, though not irreformable, was yet paramount, save in the sole case of an opposing consent of the Church, according to Mgr. Maret, the Pope is to exercise no judgment at all in that very case in which a judge is most wanted; whereas, the very Jansenists themselves allowed the Roman Bishop to be executor of the decrees of the Universal Church, this theory makes him the bond slave of a fraction.

Enough has been already said not only to show that the theory of unanimity as a necessary condition of conciliar dogmatic definitions, has no foundation in the constitution of the Church, but also to lay open the necessary inter-dependence of the Papal Primacy and Infallibility. Maintain the primacy of jurisdiction with Tournely, and you will be driven by an irresistible logic to conclusions which involve infallibility, and cannot be supported except on that basis; deny infallibility with Mgr. Maret, and the primacy becomes a mere primacy of order.

But we should not be doing justice to the strength of our own, nor to the weakness of the Gallican-Liberal case, if we omitted to notice the arguments alleged in support of that view. First comes the Vincentian canon—*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*—treated with as much reverence as a dogmatic definition of an Œcumenical Council, or as a passage of Holy Scripture, the mean-

ing of which had been undoubtedly ascertained.* The rule, as enunciated and explained by the monk of Lérins, is a concise expression of the principle that tradition, personal, temporal, and local, is the golden rule of Catholic faith. But the author's sense is unequal to the use now made of his *dictum*. What he had said in a positive sense and with reference to past time, and had explained at length in that sense, is now used negatively and of present controversy. The absurdity of the exclusive sense is apparent from the instance of the Immaculate Conception, which was certainly not taught *ab omnibus*. The chief theological school of Christendom, as a body was for ages opposed to the doctrine. To say, with S. Vincent, that what has been always and everywhere believed in the Catholic Church is to be held fast, is most true. To say that what has been denied in any place or at any time, or is now denied in any place, is to be rejected as forming no part of Catholic doctrine, is ridiculous. To interpret the Vincentian canon in such a sense, is sophistical. To say that the author of the Commonitorium was of that opinion, is unjust and untrue.

But, it is further alleged, the Vincentian canon, in a negative and exclusive sense, has been invariably acted upon in Œcumenical Councils. This argument, in so far as it is not to be met by a direct contradiction, is purely captious. It has a semblance of force at first sight, simply because Bishops who belonged to the unorthodox side, frequently absented themselves from Œcumenical Councils. No one can doubt that John of Antioch and his suffragans would have kept their places at Ephesus if they had had the slightest hope of averting, by their contrary vote, the condemnation of Nestorius. But, present or absent, the minority (or rather those Bishops, whatever their number, who were opposed to the doctrine of the Roman See) were not taken into account in the definitions of Councils. An imposing minority was not only not deferred to, but was formally declared heretical, in the first Council of Constantinople.† But even if there had never been one dissentient voice in a single Œcumenical Council, the opinion that unanimity is necessary for the validity of conciliar decisions de fide would be in no degree strengthened by the fact. Not only "a non esse ad non posse non valet argumentum," but the opinion is founded on a hypothesis which no one will defend. For it must be held to be impossible for a considerable number of Bishops to fall into heresy and obstinately adhere to their error in face of the tradition and arguments of the rest of the Episcopate,—a supposition quite utopian in its simplicity and innocence.

Not only, however, it is further alleged, has unanimity been always the practical rule of Councils, but Pope Pius IV. erected

* Commonitorium Vinc. Lerins., i. 2—3.

† Thirty-six Bishops refused to subscribe the *ὁμολόγιον*, and were condemned accordingly by a Council consisting of 150 Fathers.

the practice into a principle of jurisprudence. If a stranger to theology and church history were to light by accident on the passage in the history of the Council of Trent, which is here alluded to, doubtless he might easily fall into the mistake of supposing that Pius was referring obiter to a rule of law, instead of giving special directions for the particular conduct of a delicate and personal question. But if, getting interested in the story, he were to turn to the relation of what was said and done on another matter, no less delicate and no less hotly contested, he would perceive that he had mistaken the purport of the Pope's language. Let any one compare the passage of Pallavicino in which the historian summarizes, from the letters of the Cardinal-Secretary Borromeo,* the Pope's instructions to his Legates not to press for a definition of his relations to the Episcopate against the French opposition, with the words in which the Legates call upon the Fathers to vote on the question of residence. It is plain, if words have any meaning, that the unanimity required by Pius IV. was merely a regulation made to meet the exigencies of a special case, and was, in fact, a derogation from the ordinary law. The circumstances under which the Pope sent instructions to Trent that "those definitions only were to be made in which the Fathers should be of one mind," were briefly these. The French bishops were so determined in their opposition to the form of certain canons sent from Rome on the subject of Papal and Episcopal authority, and especially to the phrase in which the Pope was styled "ruler of the Universal Church," that an open rupture, ending in the dissolution of the Council, and perhaps a schism, was feared. In order to avoid so great a calamity, His Holiness agreed to accept the French amendments, with the exception of those which were opposed to the Papal rights as determined at Florence. He further suggested various verbal modifications of the canons in the French sense, and finally wound up his instructions on the point by saying that he would be content to have nothing expressed about his own power or that of Bishops, but only such decrees made as would gain the suffrages of all the Fathers. For the rest, provided the authority of the Apostolic See remained intact, the Legates were to do whatever they judged best for the service of God and the Church. And if they found that feeling still ran high, let them prorogue the session, and await the changes certain to be wrought by time.

The obvious interpretation of all this is, that for various reasons of expediency Pope Pius preferred to await the calming influence of time rather than push the particular question of his own prerogatives to a sudden issue. The obvious interpretation becomes necessary, when these instructions are compared with the Legates' categorical assertion that "this holy Council has been *always* used to draw up its decrees according to the majority of voices." And it

* The illustrious S. Charles.

must be borne in mind that this declaration was made in the very act of putting to the vote a dogmatic question. There can be no doubt that the Legates expressed the rule, the Pope the exception. It will be worth while to write down in parallel columns the two passages from Pallavicino, in order that our readers may see, as well as understand, the force of the comparison.*

* We shall place in the first column a translation of the summary of the letters ; in the second the formula used by the Legates :—

"The letters set forth that the Pope wished neither the dissolution of the Council nor a rupture with foreign nations. Various means were resorted to in order to satisfy, to the utmost possible extreme, not only the former proposals of the Cardinal of Lorraine, but also the subsequent requests of his French companions (*suoi Francesi*). And none appeared of difficult settlement except that of not granting to the Pope what had been attributed to him by the Council of Florence. . . . It was added to all this that in order to avoid collision with the stubbornness of the opposition (dell' altrui), the words to govern the Lord's own flock might be put in place of the aforesaid (i.e. *Bishop of the Church Universal*) . . . or even the simple phrase, *Church of God*, might be left without adding the word *universal* . . . The conclusion was, that if even in this, there were found a difficulty insurmountable without a rupture, the Pope would be content that nothing should be expressed, either about his own power or that of the Bishops, those definitions only being made in which the Fathers should all agree in one opinion. In short, provided that the authority of the Apostolic See did not suffer, the Legates might do what they should judge to be the service of God and of Christianity. And if they saw feeling still bitter and action (trattati) violent, they were to put off the session and await the aid of time, the parent of changes, which is equally able, above every art, to change, now good into evil, now evil into good."

"Whereas many fathers have said that it ought to be declared that residence is *de jure divino* ; whereas others have not spoken on that point ; while others, again, have thought that such a declaration ought not to be come to. In order that the fathers who shall be chosen to draw up the decrees may be able to draw them up in more certain form (più sicuramente), your lordships will please declare, as shortly as possible, by the word *placet* or *non placet*, whether it is your wish or not that residence be declared *de jure divino* : to the end that the decrees may be written in accordance with the greater number of votes and opinions, according to the constant practice of this Holy Council. At present this number does not seem clear, on account of the variety of opinions. Your lordships will therefore speak clearly and distinctly, so that your opinions may be taken down."

Pallavicino, Storia del Concilio di Trento, lib. xix. cap. 15 ; lib. xiv. cap. 4. Ed. Roma, 1846.

We have not seen any other arguments adduced which seem to us to call for special notice. When it is said that the faith is a deposit in the custody of all the Churches, and that therefore the unanimous testimony of all the Churches is the sole test of the infallibility of an ecclesiastical judgment, the real theological reason for requiring unanimity in Councils is expressed; but the discussion is carried beyond its terms, and comes back (as we have already said) to the general question, whether the tradition of any particular church is indefectible, and its testimony therefore infallible: in other words to the real point at issue, viz., whether the Roman Pontiff is, or is not, infallible.

In the "*Schema pro Infallibilitate Romani Pontificis*," submitted to the Council by the North American Bishops, there was a passage which seemed to favour the unanimity theory. That sense, however, was promptly disavowed by the author of the Schema. The course of events even led him to change his original opinion, that the effervescence of men's minds on the Infallibility question made unanimity on that point morally necessary to the opportuneness of the definition.* As we are going to press, the appearance of a new pamphlet, asserting the necessity of unanimity, betokens that the changes are to be rung on this question, as they have been rung on Honorius and the False Decretals.† But, as we write, the Spirit of God, at the prayer of the faithful people, is moving over the troubled waters of human disputation, and before the ink is yet well dried, will have evoked light upon the face of the deep, shown the truth in its harmonious beauty, and "divided the light from the darkness."

* The following is the passage to which reference is made in the text. It occurs in the "*Rationes ob quas schema . . . magis expedire creditur*." The whole is printed in our last number, pp. 502, sqq.

2º. "*Plena hæc Patrum omnium (vel saltem fere omnium) consensio non solum expedit, sed omnino postulari videtur, quando agitur de capite doctrinæ definiendo: præsertim in re tanti momenti; quæ sane nemine (si id fieri possit) dissentiente definiri deberet.*"

3º. "*Hoc autem tempore ejusmodi unanimitas summo opere necessaria videtur, ob voces in vulgus sparsas et ubique creditas, quibus magna inter Patres hac de re discordia esse perhibetur. Unanimis Patrum definitio hostibus nostris sic temere gloriantibus os penitus obstrueret, et maximam Ecclesiæ Dei ædificationem pareret. Profecto satis hostium externorum habemus, quin in ipsis Ecclesiæ castris nova dissidia excitemus, vel ullo modo fovere videamur.*"

Mgr. Dupanloup gave Dr. Spalding an opportunity of explaining this passage, and drew from that prelate the disavowal and expression of change of opinion mentioned in the text.

† The "*Civiltà*" of June 18th has, for the third time, returned to the discussion, in a long and exhaustive article in reply to the pamphlet referred to in the text. But as the anonymous author of the pamphlet has not introduced any new matter into the controversy, we are dispensed from the necessity of taking any special account of his work.

III.

In April (p. 496, note) we drew our readers' attention to a remark of the "*Civiltà Cattolica*," on the inaccurate expressions occasionally and incidentally used by certain eminent Ultramontane writers, concerning the *extension* of infallibility. The "*Civiltà Cattolica*" evidently feels keenly on this matter; for it repeated the same remark on April 17th (p. 217); and now, in its number for June 4th, it has once more reverted to the same theme. "Some controversialists," it says (p. 597), "in disputing on the *subject* of infallibility, speak only by accident, and then with but little exactness on its *object*; with superfluous polemical restrictions or concessions; although elsewhere they explain their meaning more adequately."*

We heartily concur with the "*Civiltà*" in this opinion; and we will take the liberty of illustrating it from Dom Gueranger's admirable work "*La Monarchie Pontificale*." We are led to choose this eminent writer for our comment, not from any disparagement of his signal claim on the respect of all Catholics, but for the very opposite reason. His authority as a theologian is so high,—his replies to Mgr. Maret and Father Gratry are so triumphant and crushing,—his services to the good cause are so singularly great,—that there is the more danger to be dreaded from any incidental mistake of expression into which he may inadvertently fall. We will proceed, therefore, to explain what is the particular point to which we here refer.

It is the doctrine of all Ultramontanes without exception, that the Pope teaches *ex cathedra* only and always, when his intention is cognizable of imposing an obligation of absolute interior assent. But Dom Gueranger seems to think that this intention is never really cognizable unless it be expressly or equivalently stated in the document itself. In order that there may be an obligation on the faithful of giving the assent of Faith to a Council's doctrinal Decree, "*it is necessary that the terms of that Decree should indicate the intention of imposing an obligation*" (*Monarchie Pontificale*, p. 230). "*It is by the tenour of the definitive Act, whatever it may be, that the Church knows with certainty the intention of that authority which speaks, and the extent of obligation imposed by that authority*" (*Ibid.* p. 232).† For ourselves, on the

* Since this was in type, the subsequent number of the "*Civiltà*" has appeared; in which the extension of Infallibility is treated so powerfully and at such length, that we publish a translation of it in another part of our number.

† In one place (p. 231) Dom Gueranger uses language, the more obvious sense of which is to deny the Church's infallibility in minor censures, in dogmatical facts, and indeed in everything except Definitions of Faith. No one, of course, would be more horrified than Dom Gueranger himself at being credited with so heterodox an opinion; but

contrary, we regard a different doctrine as absolutely certain ; and indeed as one which cannot be denied without most serious results. We regard it as an absolutely certain and essential truth, that a Pope's or a Council's intention of obliging interior assent may be most completely known from extrinsic circumstances, though it be not directly or equivalently expressed in the pronouncement itself.

Indeed, on the surface, Dom Gueranger's theory is met by most formidable instances in opposition ; viz. by the very Creeds of the Church. If there be any infallible Rule of Faith in the world, indubitably by every Catholic the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds will be so accounted ; yet neither of them expresses, either directly or equivalently, the obligation of belief which it imposes. In its original form, no doubt, an anathema of two or three contemporary heresies was appended to the Nicene Symbol : but those anathemas only covered an extremely small portion of the dogma declared in the Symbol ; and, moreover, in the Constantinopolitan expansion which is now used they are entirely omitted. Similar remarks may be made on Pope Pius's Creed, which no Ultramontane regards as of less authority than the Tridentine Council itself. But as we are unable to discuss the question at the length which its importance deserves, we will on the present occasion attempt no more, than to show that, in other parts of his work, Dom Gueranger by no means hampers himself with that particular doctrine, which he has in one section incautiously expressed.

Indeed, when he is unsuspectingly contemplating history and not devising a theory, he is as far as possible removed from those, who would compress the catalogue of *ex cathedrâ* Acts within the smallest possible compass. On the contrary, we hardly know any theologian who includes so many Pontifical utterances in that category. He not only regards as *ex cathedrâ* the "Mirari Vos" (p. 141) and the "Quanta curâ" (Ib. and p. 34)—in regard to which we never doubted his opinion,—but he also so regards (p. 112) Boniface VIII.'s "Unam sanctam ;" * nay, Nicholas III.'s

this very fact illustrates the carelessness of language into which he has permitted himself to fall. The sentence runs thus (p. 231):—"Bull, Brief, Decree—provided its promulgation be made—it matters not [which form be chosen]. But the Pontiff must manifest his decision to the Church by a direct Act, announcing his intention to pronounce on the question ; and must command the submission of faith, *qualifying the contrary opinion with the note of heresy*, and fulminating an anathema against those who should maintain it in future. The terms may vary, but such is the condition of a Decree of Faith pronounced *ex cathedrâ*." And the note, which Dom Gueranger appends, seems still more definitely to fix his words in the same sense. "For example," he says, "one may cite the Bull which defines the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. The words 'heretic,' 'excommunication,' or 'anathema,' are not there to be found ; still they are represented by equivalent terms," &c., &c.

* It is quite unintelligible to us how some excellent Catholics can have

"Exiit qui seminat" (p. 112). As to this latter Bull, Ultramontane controversialists, we believe, have hitherto almost universally denied that it was *ex cathedrâ*; though Dr. Ward, in his "Brief Summary," contended for that very view which Dom Gueranger has now adopted.

What we particularly wish however to point out is, that many Pontifical pronouncements, which Dom Gueranger admits to be *ex cathedrâ*, do not nevertheless express, either directly or equivalently, the obligation of interior assent which the respective Popes have by them intended to impose. This holds pre-eminently of the "Mirari Vos" and "Exiit," which we have already mentioned. It holds also pre-eminently of S. Leo's Letter to S. Flavian. This Letter is not only accounted *ex cathedrâ* by every individual Ultramontane theologian with the singular exception of Bellarmine, but is ordinarily used by Ultramontane controversialists as the one typical instance of an *ex cathedrâ* pronouncement. Yet this Letter contains no syllable, implying ever so distantly that S. Leo was intending to oblige the whole Church to accept its teaching. But in truth, among the various *ex cathedrâ* Acts recited by Dom Gueranger in p. 138, there are several others which entirely fail to fulfil his conditions of p. 231. Such are "S. Celestine's Decretal to the Bishops of Gaul for the condemnation of semi-pelagianism"; S. Leo's "Decretal addressed to S. Thuribius of Astorga against the errors of the Priscillianists"; S. Gregory II.'s "Decretal against the Iconoclasts"; not to mention (p. 139) many of those "numerous dogmatical definitions of Popes which have been inserted in the 'Corpus Juris' from the time of Alexander III." "Many" of these, adds Dom Gueranger, "are Letters to individuals; but their insertion in that official collection, intended for the entire Church, is *equivalent to a complete promulgation*." The author here seems to admit the very principle for which we are contending; viz., that *extrinsic* circumstances may often suffice to establish the *ex cathedrâ* character of a Pontifical Act.

There is one further remark which it may be worth while to make. Dom Gueranger (pp. 194-197) lays very great and deserved weight on the formula prescribed by Pope S. Hormisdas to the Eastern Bishops. But this formula recognizes as *ex cathedrâ* "all the Letters of Pope Leo which he wrote concerning the Christian Religion." But no one will maintain that *all* these Letters express, either directly or equivalently, an intention of obliging the Universal Church.

doubted—as certainly they have doubted—the infallible authority of this Bull. The Civiltà of June 4th has quoted very opportunely its confirmation by the Œcumenical Fifth Council of Lateran. "For the salvation of souls, and the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff and this Holy See, and the unity and power of the Church we *renew and approve that Constitution* with the approval of *this present Council*." (June 4th, p. 603.)

These brief remarks must suffice for the present, on a subject which in itself deserves far more lengthened treatment. But a circumstance has arisen, under which it seemed better to say little, than to be entirely silent on Dom Gueranger's statement.

Of the three questions discussed in this article, this last has far less obvious relation to the Council than have the two former; yet there is a very real relation notwithstanding, because the doctrine of Pontifical Infallibility has as yet so predominantly absorbed the attention of the assembled Fathers. In all human probability these lines will not long have met our readers' eye, before the hearts of innumerable devoted Catholics throughout Christendom will be unspeakably gladdened by receiving the long and earnestly-desired Definition of Pontifical Infallibility.

CONSTITUTIO DOGMATICA

DE FIDE CATHOLICA.

PIUS EPISCOPUS, SERVUS SERVORUM DEI, SACRO APPROBANTE CONCILIO AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

DEI FILIUS et generis humani Redemptor Dominus Noster Jesus Christus, ad Patrem cœlestem rediturus, cum Ecclesiâ suâ in terris militante, omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi futurum se esse promisit. Quare dilectæ sponsæ præsto esse, adsistere docenti, operanti benedicere, periclitanti opem ferre nullo unquam tempore destitit. Hæc vero salutaris ejus providentia, cum ex aliis beneficiis innumeris continenter apparuit, tum iis manifestissime comperta est fructibus, qui orbi christiano e Conciliis œcumenicis ac nominatim e Tridentino, iniquis licet temporibus celebrato, amplissimi provenerunt. Hinc enim sanctissima religionis dogmata pressius definita uberiusque exposita, errores damnati atque cohibiti; hinc ecclesiastica disciplina restituta firmitusque sancita, promotum in Clero scientiæ et pietatis studium, parata adolescentibus ad sacram militiam educandis collegia, christiani denique populi mores et accuratiore fidelium eruditione et frequentiore sacramentorum usu instaurati. Hinc præterea arctior membrorum cum visibili Capite communio, universoque corpori Christo mystico additus vigor; hinc religiosæ multiplicatæ familiæ, aliaque christianæ pietatis instituta; hinc ille etiam assiduus et usque ad sanguinis effusionem constans ardor in Christi regno late per orbem propagando.

Verumtamen hæc aliaque insignia emolumenta, quæ per ultimam maxime œcumenicam Synodum divina elementa Ecclesiæ largita est, dum grato, quo par est, animo recolimus; acerbum compescere haud possumus dolorem ob mala gravissima, inde potissimum orta, quod ejusdem sacrosanctæ Synodi apud permultos vel auctoritas contempta vel sapientissima neglecta fuere decreta.

Nemo enim ignorat, hæreses, quas Tridentini Patres proscripserunt, dum, rejecto divino Ecclesiæ magisterio, res ad religionem spectantes privati cujusvis judicio permitterentur, in sectas paullatim dissolutas esse multiplices, quibus inter se dissentientibus et concertantibus, omnis tandem in Christum fides apud non paucos labefacta est. Itaque ipsa sacra Biblia, quæ antea christianæ doctrinæ unicus fons et iudex asserebantur, jam non pro divinis haberi, imo mythicis commentis accenseri cœperunt.

Tum nata est et late nimis per orbem vagata illa rationalismi seu naturalismi doctrina, quæ religioni christianæ utpote supernaturali instituto per omnia adversans, summo studio molitur, ut Christo, qui solus Dominus et Salvator noster est, a mentibus humanis, a vitâ et moribus populorum excluso, mere quod vocant rationis vel naturæ regnum stabiliatur. Relictâ autem projectâque christianâ religione, negato vero Deo et Christo ejus, prolapsa tandem est multorum mens in pantheismi, materialismi, atheismi,

DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION

ON THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

PIUS, BISHOP, SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD, WITH
THE APPROVAL OF THE SACRED COUNCIL, FOR PER-
PETUAL REMEMBRANCE.

OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, Son of God, and Redeemer of Mankind, before returning to his heavenly Father, promised that he would be with the Church Militant on earth all days, even to the consummation of the world ; wherefore he hath never ceased to be nigh to his beloved Spouse, to stand by her when teaching, to bless her when at work, and to aid her when in danger. And this, His salutary providence, which has been constantly displayed by other innumerable benefits, has been most manifestly proved by the fruits which Christendom hath derived in such abundance from Œcumenical Councils, and particularly from that of Trent, although it was held in evil times ; for the result has been that the sacred dogmas of religion have been defined more closely, and set forth more fully, errors have been condemned and restrained, ecclesiastical discipline has been restored and more firmly secured, the love of learning and of piety has been promoted among the clergy, colleges have been established to educate youth for the sacred service, and the morals of the Christian world have been renewed by the more accurate training of the faithful, and by the more frequent use of the sacraments. Further results have been a closer communion of the members with the visible Head, and an increase of vigour in the whole mystical body of Christ, the multiplication of religious congregations and of other institutions of Christian piety, and that ardour in extending the kingdom of Christ throughout the world which never flags, and whose constancy braves death.

But while we recall with due thankfulness these and other signal benefits which the divine clemency has bestowed on the Church by the last Œcumenical Council, we cannot subdue our bitter sorrow for grave evils, which have been principally due to the fact that the authority of that sacred Synod has been contemned, or its wise decrees neglected by too many.

Everybody knows that the heresies proscribed by the Fathers of Trent, after rejecting the divine magisterium of the Church, and so surrendering to the judgment of each individual all matters regarding religion, gradually became dissolved into many sects, which disagreed and strove with one another, until at length not a few lost all faith in Christ. Even the Holy Bible, which used formerly to be declared the sole source and judge of Christian doctrine, began to be held no more divine, but to be ranked among mythical fictions.

Then arose, and too widely overspread the world, that doctrine of rationalism or naturalism which opposes in every way the Christian religion for being a supernatural institution, and works with the utmost zeal in order

barathrum, ut jam ipsam rationalem naturam, omnemque justi rectique normam negantes, ima humanæ societatis fundamenta diruere conitarentur.

Hâc porro impietate circumquaque grassante, infelicitur contigit, ut plures etiam e catholicæ Ecclesiæ filiis a viâ vere pietatis aberrarent, in iisque, diminutis paullatim veritatibus, sensus catholicus attenuaretur. Variis enim ac peregrinis doctrinis abducti, naturam et gratiam, scientiam humanam et fidem divinam perperam commiscentes, genuinum sensum dogmatum, quem tenet ac docet Sancta Mater Ecclesia, depravare, integritatemque et sinceritatem fidei in periculum adducere comperiuntur.

Quibus omnibus perspectis, fieri qui potest, ut non commoveantur intima Ecclesiæ viscera? Quemadmodum enim Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri, et ad agnitionem veritatis venire; quemadmodum Christus venit, ut salvum faceret, quod perierat, et filios Dei, qui erant dispersi, congregaret in unum: ita Ecclesia, a Deo populorum mater et magistra constituta, omnibus debetricem se novit, ac lapsos erigere, labantes sustinere, revertentes amplecti, confirmare bonos et ad meliora provehere parata semper et intenta est. Quapropter nullo tempore a Dei veritate, quæ sanat omnia, testanda et prædicanda quiescere potest, sibi dictum esse non ignorans: "Spiritus meus, qui est in te, et verba mea, quæ posui in ore tuo, non recedent de ore tuo amodo et usque in sempiternum."

Nos itaque, inherentes Prædecessorum Nostrorum vestigiis, pro supremo Nostro Apostolico munere veritatem catholicam docere ac tueri, perversasque doctrinas reprobare nunquam intermisimus. Nunc autem sedentibus Nobiscum et judicantibus universi orbis Episcopis, in hanc œcumenicam Synodum auctoritate Nostrâ in Spiritu Sancto congregatis, innixi Dei verbo scripto et tradito, prout ab Ecclesiâ catholicâ sancte custoditum et genuine expositum acceperimus, ex hâc Petri Cathedrâ in conspectu omnium salutarem Christi doctrinam profiteri et declarare constituimus, adversis erroribus potestate nobis a Deo traditâ proscriptis atque damnatis.

CAPUT I.

DE DEO RERUM OMNIUM CREATORE.

Sancta Catholica Apostolica Romana Ecclesia credit et confitetur, unum esse Deum verum et vivum, Creatorem ac Dominum cœli et terræ, omnipotentem, æternum, immensum, incomprehensibilem, intellectu ac voluntate omnique perfectione infinitum; qui cum sit una singularis, simplex omnino et incommutabilis substantia spiritualis, prædicandus est re et essentiâ a mundo distinctus, in se et ex se beatissimus, et super omnia, quæ præter ipsam sunt et concipi possunt, ineffabiliter excelsus.

Hic solus verus Deus bonitate suâ et omnipotentî virtute non ad augendam suam beatitudinem, nec ad acquirendam, sed ad manifestandam perfectionem suam per bona, quæ creaturis impertitur, liberrimo consilio simul ab initio temporis utramque de nihilo condidit creaturam, spirituales et corporales, angelicam videlicet et mundanam, ac deinde humanam quasi communem ex spiritu et corpore constitutam.

Universa vero, quæ condidit, Deus providentiâ suâ tuetur atque gubernat, attingens a fine usque ad finem fortiter, et disponens omnia suaviter. Omnia

that, after Christ, our sole Lord and Saviour, has been excluded from the minds of men, and from the life and customs of nations, the reign of what they call pure reason or nature may be established. And after forsaking and rejecting the Christian religion, and denying God and his Christ, the minds of many have sunk into the abyss of Pantheism, Materialism, and Atheism, so that, denying rational nature itself and every rule of justice and rectitude, they endeavour to destroy the lowest foundations of human society.

Unhappily, it has yet further come to pass that, while this impiety was everywhere raging, many even of the children of the Catholic Church strayed from the path of true piety, and by the gradual diminution of the truths held by them, the Catholic sense became weakened in them, for, led away by various and foreign doctrines, wrongly confounding nature and grace, human science and divine faith, they are found depraving the genuine sense of the dogmas which Holy Mother Church holds and teaches, and endangering the integrity and the soundness of the faith.

At sight of all which, how can the Church fail to be deeply stirred? For, as God wills all men to be saved, and to arrive at the knowledge of the truth; as Christ came to save what had perished, and to gather together the children of God who had been dispersed, so the Church, constituted by God the mother and mistress of nations, recognizes herself as debtor to all, and is always prepared and attentive to raise those who fall, to support those who totter, to embrace those who return, to confirm the good and to carry them on to better things: wherefore she can never rest from testifying to and proclaiming the truth of God, which heals all things, knowing that it has been said to her, "My Spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, from henceforth and for ever" (Isaiah lix. 21). We, therefore, following the footsteps of our predecessors, have never ceased, as becomes our supreme Apostolic office, from teaching and defending Catholic truth, and reprobating perverse doctrines; and now, with the Bishops of the whole world seated with us and judging, after having been assembled in the Holy Spirit by our authority in this Œcumenical Council, relying on the Word of God written and handed down as we received it from the Catholic Church, holily kept and genuinely set forth, we have determined to profess and declare the salutary teaching of Christ from this Chair of Peter and in sight of all, proscribing and condemning contrary errors by the power given to us by God.

CHAPTER I.

OF GOD, THE CREATOR OF ALL THINGS.

The Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church believes and confesses that there is one true and living God, Creator and Lord of Heaven and Earth, Almighty, Eternal, Immense, Incomprehensible, Infinite in intelligence, in will, and in all perfection, who, as being one unique, absolutely simple, and incommutable spiritual substance, must be proclaimed as really and essentially distinct from the world, perfectly happy in Himself and from Himself, and ineffably exalted above all things which either are or can be conceived except Himself.

enim nuda et aperta sunt oculis ejus, ea etiam, quæ libera creaturarum actione futura sunt.

CAPUT II.

DE REVELATIONE.

Eadem sancta Mater Ecclesia tenet et docet, Deum, rerum omnium principium et finem, naturali humanæ rationis lumine e rebus creatis certo cognosci posse; invisibilia enim ipsius, a creaturâ mundi, per ea quæ facta sunt, intellecta, conspiciuntur: attamen placuisse ejus sapientiæ et bonitati, aliâ, eâque supernaturali viâ se ipsum ac æterna voluntatis suæ decreta humano generi revelare, dicente Apostolo: "Multifariâ, multisque modis olim Deus loquens patribus in Prophetis: novissime, diebus istis locutus est nobis in Filio."

Huic divinæ revelationi tribuendum quidem est, ut ea, quæ in rebus divinis humanæ rationi per se impervia non sunt, in præsentī quoque generis humani conditione ab omnibus expedite, firmâ certitudine et nullo admixto errore cognosci possint. Non hæc tamen de causâ revelatio absolute necessaria dicenda est, sed quia Deus ex infinitâ bonitate suâ ordinavit hominem ad finem supernaturalem, ad participanda scilicet bona divina, quæ humanæ mentis intelligentiam omnino superant; siquidem oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit, quæ præparavit Deus iis, qui diligunt illum.

Hæc porro supernaturalis revelatio, secundum universalis Ecclesiæ fidem, a sanctâ Tridentinâ Synodo declaratam, continetur in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt. Qui quidem veteris et novi Testamenti libri integri cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ejusdem Concilii decreto recensentur, et in veteri vulgatâ latinâ editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis suscipiendi sunt. Eos vero Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet, non ideo quod solâ humanâ industriâ concinnati, suâ deinde auctoritate sint approbati; nec ideo dumtaxat, quod revelationem sine errore contineant; sed propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiæ traditi sunt.

Quoniam verò, quæ sancta Tridentina Synodus de interpretatione divinæ Scripturæ ad coercenda petulantia ingenia salubriter decrevit, a quibusdam hominibus pravè exponuntur, Nos, idem decretum renovantes, hanc illius mentem esse declaramus, ut in rebus fidei et morum, ad ædificationem doctrinæ Christianæ, pertinentium, is pro vero sensu sacræ Scripturæ habendus sit, quem tenuit ac tenet Sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum; atque ideo nemini licere contra hunc sensum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari.

CAPUT III.

DE FIDE.

Quum homo a Deo tanquam Creatore et Domino suo totus dependeat, et atio creata increatæ Veritati penitus subjecta sit, plenum revelanti Deo

This only true God, of His bounty and almighty virtue, not for the augmentation of His own happiness, nor for its acquisition, but to manifest His perfection by the blessings which He bestows on creatures, and of His perfectly free will, created out of nothing, at once, from the first beginning of time, both the spiritual and the corporeal creature, to wit, the angelical and the mundane, and afterwards the human creature, being constituted, as it were, common of soul and of body.

God protects and governs by His Providence all things which He hath made, "reaching from end to end mightily, and ordering all things sweetly" (Wisdom viii. 1). For all things are bare and open to His eyes, even those which are yet to be by the free action of creatures.

CHAPTER II.

OF REVELATION.

The same Holy Mother Church holds and teaches that God, the beginning and end of all things, may be certainly known by the natural light of human reason, by means of created things; for the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made (Romans i. 20), but that it pleased His wisdom and bounty to reveal Himself, and the eternal decrees of His will, to mankind by another and a supernatural way, as the Apostle says: God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all, in these days, hath spoken to us by His Son (Hebrews i. 1, 2).

It is attributable to this divine revelation that those among divine things which of themselves are not impervious to human reason can, even in the present condition of mankind, be known by all promptly, with firm certainty, and without any admixture of error. Not, however, for this reason is revelation to be called absolutely necessary; but because God of His infinite goodness ordained man to a supernatural end, viz., to be a sharer of divine blessings which utterly exceed the intelligence of the human mind: for eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man what things God hath prepared for them that love Him (1 Cor. ii. 9).

Further, this supernatural revelation, according to the universal belief of the Church, declared by the Sacred Synod of Trent, is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions which have reached us, having been received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or delivered as if by the hands of the Apostles, from the dictation of the Holy Spirit (Council of Trent, session iv., Decr. de Can. Script.). And these books of the Old and New Testament are to be received as sacred and canonical, in their integrity, with all their parts, as they are enumerated in the decree of the said Council, and are contained in the old Latin edition of the Vulgate. And the Church holds them sacred and canonical, not because, having been composed by human industry alone, they were afterwards approved by her authority, nor merely because they contain the revelation without error, but because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author, and have been delivered as such to the Church herself.

And as the things which the Holy Synod of Trent decreed soundly concerning the interpretation of Divine Scripture, in order to curb rebellious

intellectûs et voluntatis obsequium fide præstare tenemur. Hanc vero fidem, quæ humanæ salutis initium est, Ecclesia catholica profitetur, virtutem esse supernaturalem, quâ, Dei aspirante et adjuvante gratiâ, ab eo revelata vera esse credimus, non propter intrinsicam rerum veritatem naturali rationis lumine perspectam, sed propter auctoritatem ipsius Dei revelantis, qui nec falli nec fallere potest. Est enim fides, testante Apostolo, sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non apparentium.

Ut nihilominus fidei nostræ obsequium rationi consentaneum esset, voluit Deus cum internis Spiritûs Sancti auxiliis externa jungi revelationis suæ argumenta, facta scilicet divina, atque imprimis miracula et prophetias, quæ cum Dei omnipotentiam et infinitam scientiam luculenter commonstrant, divinæ revelationis signa sunt certissima et omnium intelligentiæ accommodata. Quare tum Moyses et Prophetæ, tum ipse maxime Christus Dominus multa et manifestissima miracula et prophetias ediderunt, et de Apostolis legimus: "Illi autem profecti prædicaverunt ubique, Domino cooperante, et sermonem confirmante, sequentibus signis." Et rursum scriptum est: "Habemus firmiorem propheticum sermonem, cui bene facitis attendentes quasi lucernæ lucenti in caliginoso loco."

Licet autem fidei assensus nequaquam sit motus animi cæcus: nemo tamen evangelicæ prædicationi consentire potest, sicut oportet ad salutem consequendam, absque illuminatione et inspiratione Spiritûs Sancti, qui dat omnibus suavitatem in consentiendo et credendo veritati. Quare fides ipsa in se, etiamsi per charitatem non operetur, donum Dei est, et actus ejus est opus ad salutem pertinens, quo homo liberam præstat ipsi Deo obedientiam gratiæ ejus, cui resistere posset, consentiendo et cooperando.

Porro fide divinâ et catholicâ ea omnia credenda sunt, quæ in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur, et ab Ecclesiâ sive solemnî judicio sive ordinario et universali magisterio tamquam divinitus revelata credenda proponuntur.

Quoniam vero sine fide impossibile est placere Deo, et ad filiorum ejus consortium pervenire; ideo nemini unquam sine illâ contigit justificatio, nec ullus, nisi in eâ perseveraverit usque in finem, vitam æternam assequetur. Ut autem officio veram fidem amplectendi, in eâque constanter perseverandi satisfacere possemus, Deus per Filium suum unigenitum Ecclesiam instituit, suæque institutionis manifestis notis instruxit, ut ea tamquam custos et magistra verbi revelati ab omnibus posset agnosci. Ad solam enim catholicam Ecclesiam ea pertinent omnia, quæ ad evidentem fidei christianæ credibilitatem tam multa et tam mira divinitus sunt disposita. Quin etiam Ecclesia per se ipsa, ob suam nempe admirabilem propagationem, eximiam sanctitatem et inexhaustam in omnibus bonis fecunditatem, ob catholicam unitatem, invictamque stabilitatem, magnum quoddam et perpetuum est motivum credibilitatis et divinæ suæ legationis testimonium irrefragabile.

Quo fit, ut ipsa veluti signum levatum in nationes, et ad se invitet, qui nondum crediderunt, et filios suos certiores faciat, firmissimo niti fundamento fidem, quam profitentur. Cui quidem testimonio efficax subsidium accedit ex supernâ virtute. Etenim benignissimus Dominus et errantes gratiâ suâ excitat atque adjuvat, ad ut agnitionem veritatis venire possint; et eos, quos de tenebris transtulit in admirabile lumen suum, in hoc eodem lumine ut perseverent, gratiâ suâ confirmat, non deserens, nisi deseratur. Quocirca

spirits, have been wrongly explained by some men, We, renewing the said decree, declare this to be their sense, that, in matters of faith and morals appertaining to the edification of Christian faith and doctrine, that is to be held as the true sense of Holy Scripture which Holy Mother Church hath held and holds, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scripture; and therefore that is permitted to no one to interpret the Sacred Scripture contrary to this sense, or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

CHAPTER III.

ON FAITH.

Since man depends in his entirety upon God, as upon his Creator and Lord, and since created reason is absolutely subjected to uncreated truth, we are bound to yield to God by faith the obedience of our intelligence and will. And the Catholic Church teaches that this faith, which is the beginning of man's salvation, is a supernatural virtue, whereby, inspired and assisted by the grace of God, we believe that the things which He has revealed are true, not on account of the intrinsic truth of the things viewed by the natural light of reason, but on account of the authority of God himself who reveals them, and who can neither be deceived nor deceive. For faith, as the apostle testifies, is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not (Hebrews i, 11).

Nevertheless, in order that the obedience of our faith might be in harmony with reason, God willed that to the interior help of the Holy Spirit there should be joined exterior proofs of his revelation, viz., divine facts, and principally miracles and prophecies, which, while brilliantly displaying the omnipotence and infinite knowledge of God, are most certain proofs of His divine revelation, and suited to the intelligence of all. Wherefore, both Moses and the Prophets, and, most of all, Christ our Lord himself, were authors of many and most manifest miracles and prophecies; and we read of the Apostles: but they going forth preached everywhere, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed (Mark xvi. 20). And again, it is written: we have the more firm prophetic word, whereunto you do well to attend, as to a light that shineth in a dark place (2 Peter i. 19).

But although the assent of faith is by no means a blind motion of the mind, still no man can adopt the Gospel teaching, as is necessary to obtain salvation, without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who gives the sweetness of consent and belief in the truth. (Syn. Araus. II. can. 7.) Wherefore, Faith itself, even when it does not work by charity, is in itself a gift of God, and the act of faith is a work appertaining to salvation, by which man yields a free obedience to God, by consenting to and co-operating with His grace, which he might resist.

Further, all those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the Word of God, written or handed down, and which the Church, either by a solemn judgment, or by her ordinary and universal magisterium, proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed.

And since, without faith, it is impossible to please God, and to arrive at

minime par est conditio eorum, qui per cœleste fidei donum catholicæ veritati adhæserunt, atque eorum, qui ducti opinionibus humanis, falsam religionem sectantur; illi enim, qui fidem sub Ecclesiæ magisterio susceperunt, nullam unquam habere possunt justam causam mutandi, aut in dubium fidem eandem revocandi. Quæ cum ita sint, gratias agentes Deo Patri, qui dignos nos fecit in partem sortis sanctorum in lumine, tantam ne negligamus salutem, sed aspicientes in auctorem fidei et consummatorem Jesum, teneamus spei nostræ confessionem indeclinabilem.

CAPUT IV.

DE FIDE ET RATIONE.

Hoc quoque perpetuus Ecclesiæ catholicæ consensus tenuit et tenet, duplicem esse ordinem cognitionis, non solum principio, sed objecto etiam distinctum: principio quidem, quia in altero naturali ratione, in altero fide divinâ cognoscimus; objecto autem, quia præter ea, ad quæ naturalis ratio pertingere potest, credenda nobis proponuntur mysteria in Deo abscondita, quæ, nisi revelata divinitus, innotescere non possunt. Quocirca Apostolus, qui a gentibus Deum per ea, quæ facta sunt, cognitum esse testatur, disserens tamen de gratiâ et veritate, quæ per Jesum Christum facta est, pronuntiat: "Loquimur Dei sapientiam in mysterio, quæ abscondita est, quam prædestinavit Deus ante sæcula in gloriam nostram, quam nemo principum hujus sæculi cognovit: nobis autem revelavit Deus per Spiritum suum: Spiritus enim omnia scrutatur, etiam profunda Dei. Et ipse Unigenitus confitetur Patri, quia abscondit hæc a sapientibus, et prudentibus, et revelavit ea parvulis.

Ac ratio quidem, fide illustrata, cum sedulò, piè et sobriè quærit, aliquam, Deo dante, mysteriorum intelligentiam eamque fructuosissimam assequitur, tum ex eorum, quæ naturaliter cognoscit, analogiâ, tum e mysteriorum ipsorum nexu inter se et cum fine hominis ultimo; numquam tamen idonea redditur ad ea perspicenda instar veritatum, quæ proprium ipsius objectum constituunt. Divina enim mysteria suapte naturâ intellectum creatum sic excedunt, ut etiam revelatione tradita et fide suscepta, ipsius tamen fidei velamine tectæ et quâdam quasi caligine obvoluta maneant, quamdiu in hac mortali vitâ peregrinamur a Domino: per fidem enim ambulamus, et non per speciem.

Verum etsi fides sit supra rationem, nulla tamen unquam inter fidem et rationem vera dissensio esse potest: cum idem Deus, qui mysteria revelat et fidem infundit, animo humano rationis lumen indiderit; Deus autem negare seipsum non possit, nec verum vero unquam contradicere. Inanis autem hujus contradictionis species inde potissimum oritur, quod vel fidei dogmata ad mentem Ecclesiæ intellecta et exposita non fuerint, vel opinionum commenta pro rationis effatis habeantur. Omnem igitur assertionem veritati illuminate fidei contrariam omnino falsam esse definimus. Porro Ecclesia, quæ una cum apostolico munere docendi, mandatum accepit, fidei depositum custodiendi, jus etiam et officium divinitus habet falsi nominis scientiam proscribendi, ne quis decipiatur per philosophiam, et inanem fallaciam.

copartnership with His children, therefore without faith no one has ever attained justification, nor will any one obtain eternal life, unless he shall have persevered in faith unto the end. And, that we may be able to satisfy the obligation of embracing the true faith and of constantly persevering in it, God hath instituted the Church through His only begotten Son, and hath furnished her with manifest notes of her institution, that she may be recognized by all as the guardian and the mistress of the revealed Word ; for to the Catholic Church alone belong all those many and marvellous things which have been divinely established for the evident credibility of the Christian Faith. Nay more, the Church by herself, with her admirable propagation, her eminent holiness, and her inexhaustible fecundity of everything good, with her Catholic unity and her invincible stability, is a great and perpetual motive of credibility, and an irrefutable witness of her own divine mission.

And thus, like a standard set up to the Nations (Isaiah xi. 12), she both invites to her those who do not yet believe, and lets her children know that the faith which they profess rests on the strongest foundation. And her testimony is efficaciously supported by a virtue from above. For our most benign Lord gives His grace to stir up and help those who are astray, that they may arrive at a knowledge of the truth, and to those whom He has brought out of darkness into His own admirable light He gives His grace to strengthen them to persevere in that light, deserting none who desert not him ; and therefore there is no parity between the condition of those who have adhered to the Catholic truth by the heavenly gift of faith, and of those who, led by human opinions, follow a false religion ; for those who have received the faith under the magisterium of the Church can never have any just cause for changing or doubting that faith. Therefore, rendering thanks to God the Father who has made us worthy to share the light with the Saints, let us not neglect so great a blessing, but with our eyes fixed on Jesus, the author and consummator of our Faith, let us keep unalterably the confession of our hope.

CHAPTER IV.

OF FAITH AND REASON.

The Catholic Church with perpetual consent hath also held and holds that there is a twofold order of knowledge, distinct not only in principle but also in object ; in principle, because we know in the first by natural reason, and in the second by divine faith ; in object, because, besides those things to which natural reason can reach, there are proposed to us for our belief mysteries hidden in God, which, unless divinely revealed, cannot be known. Wherefore the Apostle, who testifies that God is known by the nations through created things, still, when discoursing of the grace and truth which come by Jesus Christ (John i. 17) says : We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, a wisdom which is hidden, which God ordained before the world unto our glory ; which none of the princes of this world knew . . . but to us God hath revealed them by his spirit. For the spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God (1 Cor. ii. 7-9). And the only begotten Son himself confesses to the Father, because he has hid these things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them to little ones (Matt. xi. 25).

Quapropter omnes christiani fideles hujusmodi opiniones, quæ fidei doctrinæ contrariæ esse cognoscuntur, maxime si ab Ecclesiâ reprobatae fuerint, non solum prohibentur tanquam legitimæ scientiæ conclusiones defendere, sed pro erroribus potius, qui fallacem veritatis speciem præ se ferant, habere tenentur omnino.

Neque solum fides et ratio inter se dissidere nunquam possunt, sed opem quoque sibi mutuam ferunt, cum recta ratio fidei fundamenta demonstret, ejusque lumine illustrata rerum divinarum scientiam excolat; fides vero rationem ab erroribus liberet ac tueatur, eamque multiplici cognitione instruat. Quapropter tantum abest, ut Ecclesia humanarum artium et disciplinarum culturæ obsistat, ut hanc multis modis juvet atque promoveat. Non enim commoda ab iis ad hominum vitam dimanantia aut ignorat aut despicit; fatetur imo, eas, quemadmodum a Deo, scientiarum Domino, profectæ sunt, ita si rite pertractentur, ad Deum, juvante ejus gratiâ, perducere. Nec sane ipsa vetat, ne hujusmodi disciplinæ in suo quæque ambitu propriis utantur principiis et propriâ methodo; sed justam hanc libertatem agnoscens, id sedulo cavet, ne divinæ doctrinæ repugnando errores in se suscipiant, aut fines proprios transgressæ, ea, quæ sunt fidei, occupent et perturbent.

Neque enim fidei doctrina, quam Deus revelavit, velut philosophicum inventum proposita est humanis ingeniis perficienda, sed tanquam divinum depositum Christi Sponsæ tradita, fideliter custodienda et infallibiliter declaranda. Hinc sacrorum quoque dogmatum is sensus perpetuo est retinendus, quem semel declaravit Sancta Mater Ecclesia, nec unquam ab eo sensu, altioris intelligentiæ specie et nomine, recedendum. Crescat igitur et multum vehementerque proficiat, tam singulorum, quam omnium, tam unius hominis, quam totius Ecclesiæ, ætatum ac sæculorum gradibus, intelligentia, scientia, sapientia: sed in suo dumtaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu, eademque sententiâ.

CANONES.

I.

De Deo rerum omnium Creatore.

1. Si quis unum verum Deum visibilium et invisibilium Creatorum et Dominum negaverit; anathema sit.
2. Si quis præter materiam nihil esse affirmare non erubuerit; anathema sit.
3. Si quis dixerit, unam eandemque esse Dei et rerum omnium substantiam vel essentiam; anathema sit.
4. Si quis dixerit, res finitas, tum corporeas tum spirituales, aut saltem spirituales, e divinâ substantiâ emanasse;
aut divinam essentiam sui manifestatione vel evolutione fieri omnia;
aut denique Deum esse ens universale seu indefinitum, quod sese determinando constituat rerum universitatem in genera, species et individua distinctam; anathema sit.
5. Si quis non confiteatur, mundum, resque omnes, quæ in eo continentur:

Reason, indeed, enlightened by faith, when it seeks carefully, piously, and soberly, attains by God's gift some, and a very fruitful, understanding of mysteries, partly from the analogy of those things which it knows naturally, partly from the relations which the mysteries bear to one another and to the last end of man ; but reason never becomes capable of apprehending mysteries as it does those truths which constitute its proper object. For the divine mysteries by their own nature so far transcend the created intellect that, even when delivered by revelation and received by faith, they remain covered with the veil of faith itself, and enveloped, as it were, in a certain mist, so long as we are pilgrims in this mortal life apart from God ; for we walk by faith and not by sight (2 Cor. v. 7).

But although faith is above reason, there can still never be any true dissension between faith and reason, since the same God who reveals mysteries and infuses faith has bestowed the light of reason on the human mind, and God cannot deny himself, nor can truth ever contradict truth. The delusive semblance of this contradiction is mainly due, either to the dogmas of faith not having been understood and expounded according to the mind of the Church, or to the errors of opinions having been taken for the judgments of reason. We define, therefore, that every assertion contrary to a truth of enlightened faith is utterly false (Council of Lateran and Bull *Apostolici regiminis*). Further, the Church, which, together with the Apostolic office of teaching, has received the mandate to guard the deposit of faith, derives from God the right and the duty of proscribing false science, lest any should be deceived by philosophy and vain deceit (Coloss. ii. 8). Therefore all faithful Christians are not only forbidden to defend, as legitimate conclusions of science, such opinions as are known to be contrary to the doctrines of faith, especially if they have been reprobated by the Church, but are bound to hold them rather to be errors which wear a delusive semblance of truth.

And not only can faith and reason never be opposed to one another, but they mutually help one another ; for right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith, and, enlightened by its light, cultivates the science of things divine, while faith frees and guards reason from errors, and furnishes it with manifold knowledge. So far, therefore, is the Church from opposing the cultivation of human arts and sciences, that it in many ways helps and promotes it ; for the Church neither ignores nor despises the benefits to human life which result from the arts and sciences, but confesses that, as they came from God, the Lord of science, so, if they be rightly used, they lead to God by the help of His grace. Nor does the Church forbid that each of these sciences in its sphere should make use of its own principles and its own method, but, while recognizing this just liberty, she is sedulously on her guard, lest by repugning the divine teaching they become recipients of errors, or, transgressing their own limits, invade and trouble the domain of faith.

For the doctrine of faith which God hath revealed has not been propounded to be perfected by human talent, as a philosophical invention, but has been delivered as a divine deposit to the Spouse of Christ, to be faithfully kept and infallibly declared. Hence, also, that meaning of the sacred dogmas is perpetually to be retained which Holy Mother Church hath once declared, nor is that meaning ever to be departed from under the pretence or pretext

et spirituales et materiales, secundum totam suam substantiam a Deo ex nihilo esse productas ;

aut Deum dixerit non voluntate ab omni necessitate libera, sed tam necessario creasse, quam necessario amat seipsum ;

aut mundum ad Dei gloriam conditum esse negaverit ; anathema sit.

II.

De Revelatione.

1. Si quis dixerit, Deum unum et verum, Creatorem et Dominum nostrum, per ea, quæ facta sunt, naturali rationis humanæ lumine certo cognosci non posse ; anathema sit.

2. Si quis dixerit, fieri non posse, aut non expedire, ut per revelationem divinam homo de Deo, cultuque ei exhibendo edoceatur ; anathema sit.

3. Si quis dixerit, hominem ad cognitionem et perfectionem, quæ naturalem superet, divinitus evehi non posse, sed ex seipso ad omnis tandem veri et boni possessionem jugi profectu pertingere posse et debere ; anathema sit.

4. Si quis sacræ Scripturæ libros integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout illos sancta Tridentina Synodus rencensuit, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, aut eos divinitus inspiratos esse negaverit ; anathema sit.

III.

De Fide.

1. Si quis dixerit, rationem humanam ita independentem esse, ut fides ei a Deo imperari non possit ; anathema sit.

2. Si quis dixerit, fidem divinam a naturali de Deo et rebus moralibus scientiâ non distingui, ac propterea ad fidem divinam non requiri, ut revelata veritas propter auctoritatem Dei revelantis credatur ; anathema sit.

3. Si quis dixerit, revelationem divinam externis signis credibilem fieri non posse, ideoque solâ internâ cujusque experienciâ aut inspiratione privatâ homines ad fidem moveri debere ; anathema sit.

4. Si quis dixerit, miracula nulla fieri posse, proindeque omnes de iis narrationes, etiam in sacrâ Scripturâ contentas, inter fabulas vel mythos ablegandas esse : aut miracula certo cognosci nunquam posse, nec iis divinam religionis christianæ originem ritè probari ; anathema sit.

5. Si quis dixerit, assensum fidei christianæ non esse liberum, sed argumentis humanæ rationis necessario produci ; aut ad solam fidem vivam, quæ per charitatem operatur, gratiam Dei necessariam esse ; anathema sit.

6. Si quis dixerit, parem esse conditionem fidelium atque eorum, qui ad fidem unice veram nondum pervenerunt, ita ut catholici justam causam habere possint, fidem, quam sub Ecclesiæ magisterio jam susceperunt, assensu suspensio in dubium vocandi, donec demonstrationem scientificam credibilitatis et veritatis fidei suæ absolverint ; anathema sit.

of a deeper comprehension of them. Let, then, the intelligence, science, and wisdom of each and all, of individuals and of the whole Church, in all ages and all times, increase and flourish abundantly and vigorously, only after its own proper fashion, that is to say, in one and the same dogma, one and the same sense, one and the same opinion (Vincent of Lerins, Common. n. 28).

CANONS.

I.

Of God, the Creator of all things.

1. If any shall deny one true God, Creator and Lord of things visible and invisible ; let him be anathema.

2. If any shall not blush to affirm that besides matter there is nothing ; let him be anathema.

3. If any shall say that the substance and essence of God and of all things is one and the same ; let him be anathema.

4. If any shall say that finite things, both corporeal and spiritual, or at least spiritual, have emanated from the divine substance ; or that the divine essence by the manifestation and evolution of itself becomes all things ; or, in fine, that God is universal or indefinite being, which by determining itself constitutes the universality of things, distinct according to genera, species, and individuals ; let him be anathema.

5. If any confess not that the world, and all things which are contained in it, both spiritual and material, have been in their whole substance produced by God out of nothing ; or shall say that God created, not of his will free from all necessity, but as necessarily as he loves himself ; or shall deny that the world was made for the glory of God ; let him be anathema.

II.

Of Revelation.

1. If any shall say that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be certainly known by the natural light of human reason through created things ; let him be anathema.

2. If any shall say that it is impossible or inexpedient that man be taught by divine revelation of God and of the worship to be paid to him ; let him be anathema.

3. If any shall say that man cannot be divinely raised to a higher than natural knowledge and perfection, but can and should, by a continuous progress, arrive at length of himself to the possession of all that is true and good ; let him be anathema.

4. If any shall not receive as sacred and canonical the Books of Holy Writ, entire with all their parts, as the Holy Synod of Trent enumerated them, or shall deny that they have been divinely inspired ; let him be anathema.

III.

Of Faith.

1. If any shall say that human reason is so independent that faith cannot be prescribed to it by God ; let him be anathema.

IV.

De Fide et Ratione.

1. Si quis dixerit, in revelatione divinâ nulla vera et proprie dicta mysteria contineri, sed universa fidei dogmata posse per rationem rite excultam e naturalibus principiis intelligi et demonstrari; anathema sit.

2. Si quis dixerit, disciplinas humanas eâ cum libertate tractandas esse, ut earum assertiones, etsi doctrinæ revelatæ adversentur, tanquam veræ retineri, neque ab Ecclesiâ proscribi possint; anathema sit.

3. Si quis dixerit, fieri posse, ut dogmatibus ab Ecclesiâ propositis, aliquando secundum progressum scientiæ sensus tribuendus sit alius ab eo, quem intellexit et intelligit Ecclesia; anathema sit.

Itaque supremi pastoralis Nostri officii debitum exequentes, omnes Christi fideles, maxime vere eos, qui præsumunt vel docendi munere funguntur, per viscera Jesu Christi obtestamur, nec non ejusdem Dei et Salvatoris nostri auctoritate jubemus, ut ad hos errores a Sanctâ Ecclesiâ arcendos et eliminandos, atque purissimæ fidei lucem pandendam studium et operam conferant.

Quoniam verò satis non est, hæreticam pravitatem devitare, nisi ii quoque errores diligenter fugiantur, qui ad illam plus minusve accedunt; omnes officii monemus, servandi etiam Constitutiones et Decreta, quibus pravi ejusmodi opiniones, quæ isthic diserte non enumerantur, ab hâc Sanctâ Sede proscriptæ et prohibitæ sunt.

Datum Romæ in publicâ Sessione in Vaticanâ Basilicâ solemniter celebratâ anno Incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo octingentesimo septuagesimo, die vigesimâ quartâ Aprilis.

Pontificatûs Nostri anno vigesimo quarto.

Ita est.

JOSEPHUS,

Episcopus S. Hippolyti,

Secretarius Concilii Vaticani.

2. If any shall say that divine faith is not distinguished from natural knowledge of God and of moral things, and that therefore it is not requisite for divine faith that revealed truth be believed because of the authority of God, who reveals it ; let him be anathema.

3. If any shall say that divine revelation cannot be made credible by outward signs, and therefore that men must be moved to faith by the solely internal experience of each, or by private inspiration ; let him be anathema.

4. If any shall say that no miracle can be performed, and therefore that all narrations concerning them, even those contained in Holy Writ, are to be relegated among fables or myths ; or that miracles can never be known with certainty, and that the divine origin of Christianity cannot be proved by them ; let him be anathema.

5. If any shall say that the assent of Christian faith is not free, but is necessarily produced by the arguments of human reason ; or that the grace of God is necessary for that living faith only which worketh by charity ; let him be anathema.

6. If any shall say that the condition of the faithful and of those who have not yet arrived at the only true faith is equal, so that Catholics may have just cause for doubting, with suspended assent, the faith which they have already received under the magisterium of the Church, until they shall have obtained a scientific demonstration of the credibility and truth of their faith ; let him be anathema.

IV.

Of Faith and Reason.

1. If any shall say that in divine revelation no true mysteries properly so called are contained, but that all the dogmas of faith can be understood and demonstrated from natural principles by properly cultivated reason ; let him be anathema.

2. If any shall say that human sciences are to be treated with such freedom that their assertions, although they may be opposed to revealed doctrine, are to be retained as true, and cannot be proscribed by the Church ; let him be anathema.

3. If any shall say that it may happen that sometimes, according to the progress of science, a sense is to be given to dogmas propounded by the Church different from that which the Church hath understood and understands ; let him be anathema.

Therefore, fulfilling the duty of our supreme pastoral office, we entreat, by the bowels of Jesus Christ, and by our God's and Saviour's authority we command, all the faithful of Christ, and chiefly those who preside over them, or perform the office of teaching, that they will devote zeal and labour to ward off, and eliminate from, Holy Church these errors, and to spread the true light of pure faith.

And since it is not sufficient to shun heretical pravity, unless those errors also be diligently avoided which approach it more or less closely, we admonish all of the duty of also observing those constitutions and decrees by which those evil opinions of the like sort, which are not here enumerated at length, have been proscribed and prohibited by this Holy See.

PAPAL BRIEF.

THE HOLY FATHER has been graciously pleased to address the following Brief to Doctor Ward:—

PIUS P.P. IX.

DILECTE FILI, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.—
Gratulamur tibi, dilecte fili, quod in filiorum Dei lucem vocatus, idem lumen aliorum mentibus offundere certes, et, in gremium sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ receptus, sanctitatem ejus ostendere et illustrare studeas, supremique ejusdem Pastoris divinam asserere auctoritatem, vindicare prærogativas, jura omnia tueri. Nobilitatem in hoc videmus animi, qui ad veritatem maturo compulsus, examine eo incensiore ignis flagrat amore, quo majore contentione illam est adeptus; et eo impensiore nisu beneficium acceptum latius porrigere satagit, quo miseriorem, propria doctus experientia censet errantium conditionem. Indefessus autem labor quo pluribus ab hinc annis dona omnia ingenii, scientiæ, eruditionis, eloquentiæ tibi a Domino largita, confers ad religionis nostræ Sanctissimæ et hujus Apostolicæ Sedis causam propugnandam fidem, perspicue præfert inditam menti tuæ et charitatem in tuo corde diffusam, quibus urgeris ad redimendum præteritum tempus, et certamen imprudenter alias pro errore fortasse commissum rependendum per alacrem ac strenuam veritatis defensionem. Quoniam vero merces fidelis paratur seminanti justitiam, et qui ad eam erudiunt multos fulgebunt quasi stellæ in perpetuas æternitates, dum te tuum ita sertum texere gaudemus, te simul hortamur ut instes proposito tuo, et impigre præliari pergas prælia Domini, quo et plures semper ad viam veritatis adducas et splendidius tibi compares æternæ gloriæ pondus. Necessarias idcirco ad hoc vires tibi ominamur, copiosaque adprecamur gratiæ cœlestis auxilia et fausta omnia; eorumque auspicem et paternæ nostræ benevolentiae pignus Apostolicam Benedictionem tibi peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romæ, apud Sanctum Petrum, die 4 Julii, anno 1870, Pontificatûs Nostri anno vicesimo quinto.

PIUS P.P. IX.

Dilecto Filio GEORGIO WARD.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS.

UNDER this head we will first give a translation of Cardinal Antonelli's letter to Count Daru. The original Italian of this letter will be found in the "Civiltà Cattolica" of May 21st. So much has been said lately about the "extreme views" to which Rome is supposed to be committed on the mutual relations of ecclesiastical and civil authority, that our readers will be glad to see an authentic statement of the true Roman doctrine on the subject.

But there is also another reason, entirely distinct, which has influenced us a good deal towards publishing the letter. It appears from it, that the report given in the "Augsburg Gazette," however discredibly obtained, was nevertheless perfectly correct, as to the proposed Canon, which is to be submitted to the Vatican Council for episcopal approbation, concerning the Church's extent of infallibility. It will be proposed to define, under sanction of anathema, that the Church's infallibility "extends not only to the Deposit of the Faith, but to all that is necessary for the preservation of such Deposit." And Cardinal Antonelli, while making the obvious remark that the Canon may possibly receive some "modification from the judgment and decision of the Episcopate," nevertheless declares that it is in itself no more than "the exposition of the maxims and fundamental principles of the Church; principles repeated over and over again in the Acts of former General Councils." Our readers will remember, that this doctrine was one of the principal theses for which we contended, in our recent controversy on the extent of infallibility. For ourselves we should be inclined to say that it was the most fundamental point at issue.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE APOSTOLIC NUNCIO
AT PARIS.

Rome, March 19th, 1870.

MY LORD,—

The Marquis de Banneville, ambassador of his Majesty, read me a few days ago, a despatch forwarded to him under date the 20th of February last, from Count Daru, Minister of Foreign Affairs, relative to the affairs of the Council. In this communication, of which the ambassador was kind enough to leave me a copy, the aforesaid minister, referring to the resolution come to by the French Government not to take part in the deliberations of the General Council, desiring at the same time its liberty to be guaranteed fully and absolutely, states that such resolution was based on the supposition that that venerable assembly would occupy itself

solely about the sacred interests of the Faith, and would abstain from touching questions of a purely political order. But the publication (he says) by the "Augsburg Gazette," of the canons appertaining to the draft of constitution on the Church and on the Roman Pontiff, showing that there is question of deciding whether the power of the Church, and of her Head extends to the whole aggregate of political rights; the Government, keeping firmly to the resolution of leaving, upon this point also, entire liberty to the deliberations of the august assembly, intends to exercise the right given it by the Concordat of making known to the Council its opinion on questions of such nature.

Passing to the examination of the said canons, the minister sums up their contents (on which he wishes to comment) in the two following propositions:—First, "the Infallibility of the Church extends not only to the Deposit of Faith, but to all that is necessary for the preservation of such Deposit"; and secondly, "the Church is a society divine and perfect; its power is exercised at once *in foro interno et externo*; is absolute in the legislative, judicial, and coercive order, and is to be exercised by her with full liberty and independence from any civil power whatever." Hence, as corollaries of these two propositions, he deduces the extension of infallibility to all that is thought necessary for the defence of revealed truths, and consequently to facts, whether historical, philosophical, or scientific, external to revelation: as also the absolute subordination to the supreme authority of the Church, of the constituent principles of civil society; of the rights and duties of government; of the political rights and duties of citizens, whether electoral or municipal; of all that relates to the judicial and legislative order, as well in respect of persons as of things; of the rules of public administration; of the rights and duties of corporations. and in general, of all the rights of the State, not excluding the rights of conquest, peace, and war.

Next the minister passes on to note the profound impression which the simple enunciation of such doctrines must produce in the entire world; and asks at the same time how it could be possible for the bishops to consent to abdicate their episcopal authority, concentrating it in the hands of one alone; and how it could have been imagined that princes would lower their sovereignty before the supremacy of the Court of Rome.

Lastly, concluding, from all that has been set forth, that political and not religious interests are being discussed in the Council, Count Daru demands that the Governments be heard, or at least admitted to bear testimony to the characters, dispositions, and spirit (*disposizioni di spirito*) of the peoples they represent; and in particular that since France, by reason of the special protection which for twenty years she has exercised over the Pontifical State, has quite special duties to perform, he demands that the Government of that nation be permitted to exercise its right of receiving communication of projected decisions touching politics, and of requesting the delay necessary for bringing its observations before the Council, before any resolution be adopted by the same.

This is an abstract of the despatch communicated to me by the Marquis de Banneville. I have thought proper to inform your Lordship of it; with

the view, moreover, of communicating to you some short considerations which I think necessary to put in a clearer light the points touched upon by the minister, and to reply to the deductions made by him with respect to the points submitted to the deliberations of the Council.

And first, I cannot dispense myself from manifesting to your Lordship the satisfaction with which the Holy Father received the declaration expressed at the beginning of Count Daru's despatch, and repeated in the sequel, of the fixed intention of the French Government to respect, and cause to be respected, in any event, the full liberty of the Council, as well in the discussion of the constitution referred to as of all others which shall hereafter come to be proposed to the examination of the venerable assembly. This declaration, which does great honour to the Government of a Catholic nation, is considered by the Holy See as the natural consequence of that protection which, for more than twenty years, France has exercised towards it; a protection which has called forth several times public demonstrations of gratitude on the part of the Supreme Pontiff, who always, but especially at the present moment, cannot do less than recognize and appreciate all its importance.

But, coming closer to the object of Count Daru's despatch, I must say frankly that I am quite unable to understand (*non mi è dato di comprendere*) how the declarations contained in the draft of Constitution on the Church, and the respective canons—published in the "*Augsburg Gazette*" by a breach of the Pontifical secret—could have produced so grave and profound an impression on the mind of the French Cabinet, as to induce it to change the line of conduct which it had properly traced out for itself in regard to the discussions of the Vatican Council. The subjects treated in that draft of constitution, and in the canons appertaining to it, whatever modification they may undergo in the sequel from the judgment and decision of the Episcopate, are no more than the exposition of the maxims and fundamental principles of the Church; principles repeated over and over again in the Acts of former General Councils, proclaimed and developed in several Pontifical Constitutions, published in all Catholic states, and in particular in the celebrated dogmatic Bulls beginning, "*Unigenitus*," and "*Auctorem Fidei*," where all the aforesaid doctrines are generally confirmed and sanctioned; principles, finally, which have constantly formed the basis of teaching in all periods of the Church, and in all Catholic schools, and have been defended by an innumerable host of ecclesiastical writers, whose works have served for text in public schools and colleges, as well Government schools as others, without any contradiction on the part of the civil authority, but rather, for the most part, with the approbation and encouragement of the same.

Much less would it be possible for me to agree upon the character and extent given by the minister to the doctrines contained in the aforesaid canons. In virtue of them there is not attributed, either to the Church or the Roman Pontiff, that direct and absolute power over the whole aggregate of political rights, of which the despatch speaks; nor is the subordination of the civil to the religious power to be understood in the sense set forth by him, but in another order of quite different bearing.

And in truth the Church has never intended, nor now intends, to exercise any direct and absolute power over the political rights of the State. Having received from God the lofty mission of guiding men, whether individually or as congregated in society, to a supernatural end, she has by that very fact the authority and the duty to judge concerning the morality and justice of all acts, internal and external, in relation to their conformity with the natural and divine law. And as no action, whether it be ordained by a supreme power, or be freely elicited by an individual, can be exempt from this character of morality and justice, so it happens that the judgment of the Church, though falling directly on the morality of the acts, indirectly reaches over everything with which that morality is conjoined. But this is not the same thing as to interfere directly in political affairs, which, by the order established by God and by the teaching of the Church herself, appertains to the temporal power without dependence on any other authority. The subordination also of the civil to the religious power is in the sense of the pre-eminence of the sacerdotium over the imperium, because of the superiority of the end of the one over that of the other.* Hence the authority of the imperium depends on that of the sacerdotium, as human things on divine, temporal on spiritual. And if temporal happiness, which is the end of the civil power, is subordinate to eternal beatitude, which is the spiritual end of the sacerdotium, it follows that in order to reach the end to which it has pleased God to direct them, the one power is subordinate to the other. Their powers (I say) are respectively subordinate in the same way as the ends to which they are directed.

It results from these principles that, if the infallibility of the Church extends also (not, however, in the sense indicated by the French despatch) to all that is necessary to preserve intact the Deposit of Faith, no harm is thereby done to science, history, or politics. The prerogative of infallibility is not an unknown fact in the Catholic world; the supreme *magisterium* of the Church has dictated in every age rules of faith, without the internal order of States being thereby affected (*risentirsene*), or princes being disquieted thereat; rather, wisely appreciating the influence which such rules have on the good order of civil society, these have been themselves, from time to time, the vindicators and defenders of the doctrines defined, and have promoted, by the concurrence of the royal power, their full and respectful observance.

It follows, moreover, that if the Church was instituted by its Divine Founder as a true and perfect society, distinct from the civil power and independent of it, with full authority in the triple order, legislative, judicial, and coercive, no confusion springs therefrom in the march of human society, and in the exercise of the rights of the two powers. The competence of the one and the other is clearly distinct and determined, according to the end to which they are respectively directed. The Church

* We have no exact English equivalents for the abstract terms—*sacerdotio*, *impero*. "*Sacerdotio*" means the priestly office, and "*impero*" civil authority, in the most general sense.—(Note of Tr.)

does not, in virtue of her authority, intervene directly and absolutely in the constitutive principles of governments, in the forms of civil regulations, in the political rights of citizens, in the duties of the State, and in the other points indicated in the minister's note. But, whereas, no civil society can subsist without a supreme principle regulating the morality of its acts and laws, the Church has received from God this lofty mission, which tends to the happiness of the people; while she in no way embarrasses, by the exercise of this her ministry, the free and prompt action of governments. She, in fact, by inculcating the principle of rendering to God that which is God's, and to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, imposes at the same time upon her children the obligation of obeying the authority of princes for conscience sake. But these should also recognize that if anywhere a law is made opposed to the principles of eternal justice, to obey would not be a giving to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, but a taking from God that which is God's.

I proceed now to say a word on the profound impression which the minister expects will be made throughout the world by the mere enunciation of the principles developed in the draft of constitution which forms the object of his despatch. In truth it is not easy to persuade oneself how the doctrines contained in that draft, and understood in the sense above pointed out, can produce the profound impression of which the minister speaks; unless indeed their spirit and character be wrested, or that he speaks of those who, professing principles different from those professed by the Catholic Church, cannot of course approve of such principles being inculcated and sanctioned afresh. I say afresh; because the doctrines contained in that document, as I have already remarked, far from being new and unheard of, embrace no more (*non sono nel loro complesso*) than the reproduction of the Catholic teaching professed in every age and in every Church, as will be solemnly proved by all the pastors of the Catholic name, called by the head of the hierarchy to bear authentic witness, in the midst of the Council, to the faith and traditions of the Church Universal. It is to be hoped rather that the Catholic doctrine, once more solemnly confirmed by the Fathers of the Vatican Council, will be greeted by the faithful people as the rainbow of peace and the dawn of a brighter future. The object of confirming those doctrines is no other than to recall to modern society the maxims of justice and virtue, and thus to restore to the world that peace and prosperity which can only be found in the perfect keeping of the divine law. This is the firm hope of all honest men, who received with joy the announcement of the Council; this is the conviction of the Fathers of the Church, who have assembled with alacrity in such numbers at the voice of the Chief Pastor; this is the prayer which the Vicar of Jesus Christ is always sending up to God in the midst of the grievous troubles which surround his Pontificate.

For the rest I do not understand why the bishops should have to renounce their episcopal authority in consequence of the definition of Pontifical Infallibility. This prerogative is not only as ancient as the Church herself, but has been, moreover, always exercised in the Roman Church, without the divine authority and the rights conferred by God on the pastors of the

Church being thereby altered in the least degree. Its definition therefore would in no way go to change the relations between the bishops and their head. The rights of the one and the prerogatives of the other are well defined in the Church's divine constitution ; and the confirmation of the Roman Pontiff's supreme authority and magisterium, far from being prejudicial to the rights of bishops, will furnish a new support to their authority and magisterium, since the strength and vigour of the members is just so much as comes to them from the head.

By parity of reason—the authority of the pastors of the Church being strengthened anew by the solemn confirmation of Pontifical Infallibility—that of princes, especially Catholic princes, will be no less strengthened. The prosperity of the Church and the peace of the State depend upon the close and intimate union of the two supreme powers. Who does not see then that the authority of princes not only will not receive any blow from the pontifical supremacy, but will instead find therein its strongest support ? As sons of the Church they owe obedience, respect, and protection to the authority placed on earth by God to guide princes and peoples to the last end of eternal salvation ; nor can they refuse to recognize that royal power has been granted them for the defence also and guardianship of Christian society. But by the very fact of the principle of authority receiving new vigour in the Church and in its head, the sovereign power must necessarily receive a new impulse, since it has from God a common origin, and consequently common interests also. And so, if the wickedness of the age, by separating the one from the other, has placed both in troublesome and painful conditions, to the great injury of human society, closer relations will unite both in indissoluble bonds for the defence of the grand interests of religion and society, and will prepare for them the way to a brighter and more prosperous future.

From what has been said up to this point it results clearly that the Council; has not been called to discuss political interests, as the despatch of Count Dauri seems to indicate. We may conclude, therefore, that the French Government, finding no longer a sufficient reason for departing from the line of conduct it had set itself to follow in respect of the Council, will not desire to insist on the request for communication of the Decrees which will be submitted to the examination and discussion of the venerable assembly of bishops. On which point indeed it occurs to me to observe that the right claimed for his purpose by the minister on the ground of the Concordat in force between the Holy See and France, cannot, in my opinion, find any support in that act. In the first place, no special mention of this particular point is found in the articles of that convention. Then, further, the relations of Church and State on points belonging to both powers (*punto di mista competenza*) having been regulated by the Concordat, the decisions, which may be come to by the Vatican Council on such matters will in no way alter the special stipulations made by the Holy See, as well with France as with other governments, as long as these place no obstacles in the way of the full keeping of the conditions agreed upon. I may also add that if the Holy See has not thought fit to invite Catholic princes to the Council, as it did on other occasions, every one will easily understand that this is chiefly

to be attributed to the changed circumstances of the times. The altered state of the relations between the Church and the Civil Governments has made more difficult their mutual action in the regulation of things religious.

I desire however to hope that the Government of his Majesty the Emperor, fully satisfied with the explanations given by me in the name of the Holy See to the various points of Count Daru's despatch, and recognizing at the same time the difficulties in which the Holy Father might find himself, will not insist further on the demand of communication beforehand of the drafts of constitutions to be examined by the Fathers of the Council. Were such demand conceded, there would be question of things tending to embarrass the free action of the Council. Moreover, since the Church is keeping within the limits assigned to her by her Divine Founder, no anxiety need remain to the Government of his Majesty on account of the deliberations which may come to be adopted by the Episcopal assembly. Finally the French Government will thus give, by the very fact, a new proof of those dispositions of goodwill which it has manifested in respect of the full liberty of the Conciliar deliberations, and of the confidence which it declares it reposes in the wisdom and prudence of the Apostolic See.

Your Lordship will please read this despatch to Count Daru, as also leave him a copy.

Meanwhile receive, &c. &c.,

(Signed) G. CARD. ANTONELLI.

We next place before our readers some most important remarks of the "*Civiltà*" (June 18th) on the extension of the Church's Infallibility. It is admitted, of course, by all Catholics, that that Infallibility extends over the whole "*materia fidei et morum*," but some persons, from inadvertence, are far from realising the wide extent of this "*materia*." The "*Civiltà*," then, in reviewing the second edition of F. Knox's classical work, expresses itself as follows:—

We have much pleasure in announcing the second English edition, enlarged and improved, of the excellent work of F. Knox; and we should be glad to have to announce forthwith the second edition of the Italian translation, as soon as the first edition, which we praised at p. 349 of the last volume, is exhausted. As we then observed, though the work embraces all the questions which relate to infallibility, it treats more especially of the *object*, which is evidently the same both for the Pope and for the teaching Church.

After establishing once for all the *subject* of the infallible teaching office, the author places, in a clear light, the principle that the *object* of the Church's infallibility can only be learnt authentically from the Church herself, that is, from the *subject* of infallibility itself. As the Church, when she has proved her divine mission by the motives of credibility, proposes practically for our belief, as revealed among her other prerogatives, her infallibility, so it belongs to her to teach what is the *object*, what the limits, and what the extension of this infallibility; in other words, how far the promised assistance of the

Spirit of truth reaches; the more so since this must be contained in the deposit of the revelation intrusted to her.

And it is in this precisely that the peculiar merit of F. Knox's work consists. In order to ascertain when, how, and under what conditions the Church teaches infallibly, he interrogates specially the Church's practice, and from the living exercise of her teaching office, rather than from the various opinions of theologians, he deduces his replies to the different questions which arise relative to the *object* of infallibility.

"What is the object-matter," he asks, "of the Church's infallibility; *i.e.*, what precisely is the sphere within which she teaches infallibly? To reply to this question, we must consult the Church herself. She is God's ambassador. She alone knows the extent of her powers. We have admitted her credentials and accepted her as God's envoy. It is therefore only reasonable that we should believe her word in what she tells us about the object and scope of her mission. Whatever she declares to be within the province of her infallibility as our teacher, must be within it. If we prove that she has claimed to speak infallibly on any point, we have proved that she has spoken infallibly upon it. Now the Church does not derive her powers from a written document. She came into existence as a living and energizing institution. There was, therefore, no need for her to begin by defining accurately the extent of her authority. She declared the powers which she possessed by using them. Thus, in God's providence, the course of events has served to exhibit, with increasing definiteness, the full extent of the Church's infallible authority as teacher, and to mark out more and more accurately the field over which it ranges" (p. 49).

Hence, according to the practical sense of the Church, he points out that, speaking generally, the object of infallibility is contained in the general formula *in rebus fidei et morum*. From the words spoken by Christ to the Apostles, All truths (John xvi. 13), all that I have said to you (John xiv. 26), all that I have commanded you (Matth. xxviii. 18);—"i.e., the whole economy of salvation, all, namely, that men have to believe and do in order to attain eternal life, falls under the Church's authority as teacher, and, therefore, under her infallibility. Hence has come the common definition that the Church is infallible in all that she teaches regarding faith and morals, since faith refers to what we must believe, and morals to what we must do. And the definition is a correct one, provided care be taken to explain that by matters of faith and morals are meant, not only the truths directly revealed by our Blessed Lord to His Apostles, whether explicitly or implicitly, but also every other branch of truth, speculative or practical, which has any bearing upon revealed truth. On the other hand, if the words faith and morals are so interpreted as to confine the Church's infallibility to revealed truth exclusively, the definition becomes false and dangerous" (pp. 51, 52).

This, he adds, *was what the Jansenists wished to do*.

"From what has been said," he continues, "it is evident that the sphere of the Church's infallible teaching is very extensive, and embraces a great many different subjects, since there can be very few branches of truth which have not some connection with revealed dogma. This, however, will appear still more clearly when we examine in detail the object-matter of her teaching office" (p. 54).

The author next examines particularly, one by one, the matter of the Church's infallible teaching, taking specially into account the actual practice of the Church, and holding firmly to the principle that if the Church attributes to herself infallibility in regard to the object of her teaching, she cer-

tainly does not usurp this prerogative, but possesses it. The primary and immediate object of infallibility is undoubtedly revealed truth ; but though the relation in which other truths stand to this, the Church judges infallibly concerning them, as a secondary and mediate object. The author classes them as follows :—1. Truths contained explicitly or implicitly in revelation. 2. General principles of morality, including natural morals. 3. Dogmatic and moral facts, as the sense of a book in relation to the faith, the canonization of saints, constitutions relative to general ecclesiastical discipline and worship, the approbation of religious orders, the condemnation of certain societies, the approval or condemnation of certain systems of education, etc. 4. Political truths and principles. 5. Theological conclusions. 6. Philosophical and scientific conclusions in their relation to dogma or morals. After discussing these heads separately, he thus summarizes them in the following formula :—

“ The object-matter of the Church’s infallibility embraces, primarily and directly, all revealed truth, whether explicitly or implicitly contained in the revealed deposit ; and secondarily, and indirectly, *all natural truths, both of fact and speculation, which stand in such relation to revealed truth that error concerning them would tend to impair the integrity of the faith in the minds of Christians and to imperil their eternal salvation* ” (p. 81).

Throughout the whole of this particular examination into the object of infallibility, the author, while reasoning theologically, has his eye chiefly fixed upon the actual practice of the Church, whom he has ever before him, as a teacher, not after the fashion of an uncertain abstraction, but as a living person.

In going through the different heads, he draws attention to the more or less evident relation in which many parts of the Church’s teaching stand to the Deposit of the Faith, on which is founded the Church’s right to teach us infallibly ; and, above all, he points out that the Deposit of the Faith is always the norm and rule by which the Church judges of the truth or falsehood of non-revealed doctrines, whether philosophical or political, and which she therefore regards from no other point of view except that of dogma and morals.

“ She forms her judgment concerning them, not by working over again the process which the philosopher had gone through, and thus discovering where his error lay, but by comparing his results with revealed truth and estimating them accordingly. Thus, one who sees corrects at a glance the faulty conclusions which a blind man has slowly and painfully arrived at, by touch and hearing, regarding the shape and position of certain objects. This he does not by touch and hearing, but by another sense—sight, of which the blind man is destitute. In like manner the Church, whose eyes are opened to the light of faith, is able, by the aid of this supernatural light, to declare infallibly that a philosophical system, or proposition, or book is unsound ; and she has many times in the course of her history exercised this power when her children’s needs required it ” (pp. 76, 77).

He inculcates once again the same principle, when he speaks of the nature of doctrinal condemnations :—

“ What,” he asks, “ is the Church’s standard by which she tests and condemns faulty doctrines ? It can only be the Deposit of the Faith, including in this, of course, the general principles of the moral law. For

she has no other standard by which to judge but this ; and it is only from the point of view in which a given doctrine has a bearing upon revealed truth, and is therefore commensurable with it, that she regards it as subject to her jurisdiction. The Church's doctrinal condemnations are therefore equivalent to formal pronouncements that the particular doctrines she condemns are at variance in one point or other with the Catholic Faith. The various modes in which they may stand opposed to the faith are expressed by a more or less fixed terminology ; and a proposition is said to have been censured, when sentenced has been pronounced upon it indicating that it is out of harmony with the faith " (pp. 99, 100).

At this point it is natural to inquire whether the *object* of the Church's infallibility in pronouncing such censures is to be restricted to the censures of heresy, or should be extended to the minor censures. The author deduces his answer from the same principle of the Church's practical teaching :—

"The Church, in the exercise of her office of teacher, claims the power not only of declaring infallibly that a given doctrine is in opposition to the revealed deposit, but of determining, if she pleases, the exact degree and kind of this opposition. In other words, she asserts her right to assign properly to each proposition which she condemns the censure which belongs to it. The particular way, however, in which she has exercised this power has varied at different periods of her history " (pp. 100, 101).

"The same reasons," the author remarks, "which go to prove that we are bound to conform ourselves interiorly to what the Church declares to be immediately opposed to the faith, show with equal force that we are bound to submit ourselves in like manner to her pronouncements when she defines that a doctrine only indirectly deviates from the faith, and so deserves a censure less than heretical. There is no rational ground for a distinction between these two cases, unless we deny her infallibility as teacher in regard to lesser deviations from the faith, while admitting it in respect of the highest kind of deviation. She herself, however, practically rejects this distinction, by requiring from us, under pain of sin, the same submission in the one case as in the other. And since what she claims she has a right to claim, from her practice we may legitimately infer her infallibility."

[This passage occurs at p. 75 of the first edition of F. Knox's book, but, the chapter containing it having been recast in the second edition, the precise words are not now to be found there, though the argument which they express remains unchanged.—Ed. D. R.]

So again on the same principle of the different practice of the Church, the *object* of infallibility is not to be restricted to the use of certain formalities and conditions ; for example, the threat of anathema, which some theologians require to be appended to the definitions either of the Sovereign Pontiff or of the teaching Church :—

"The shape in which these pronouncements are cast, and the formalities by which they are accompanied, are merely accidental circumstances, which admit of considerable variation. That which makes these utterances infallible, and is at the same time the *only sign by which we may know that they are infallible*, is the will and intention of the Sovereign Pontiff to teach by means of them the universal flock, with the authority that belongs to him as its divinely constituted Pastor " (p. 62, 1st edition).

In like manner it depends upon the Church to determine what obligation she imposes upon the faithful. Sometimes it will be merely a disciplinary obligation of silence, without defining the question. But if the Church or the Pope passes a decisive doctrinal sentence, a respectful silence or a so-

called provisional assent will not suffice. An internal assent, under pain of mortal sin, is requisite, and this must be either an assent of divine faith immediately, if the thing is proposed for belief as revealed, or else an assent of *intellectual obedience* to the divine teaching authority of the Church, and therefore of divine faith mediately, if the thing is proposed as true owing to its connection with revelation, of which the Church is the infallible guardian.

Thus, by the help of this fundamental principle of the practical teaching of the Church, F. Knox solves with great simplicity and soundness all the questions which relate to the object of infallibility, and the obligations of the faithful towards the teaching Church :—

“As we did not choose the Church for our teacher, nor give her authority to teach us, so neither can we set limits to her teaching, nor free ourselves from the obligation of obeying her. Her power comes from Christ, whom she represents. And since He has put no restriction on the obedience which she can claim from us, it follows that whatever she bids us do we are bound to do, and whatever she bids us believe we are bound to believe. *Our obedience to her must be absolute, unbounded, and unreasoning, as to the voice of God Himself*” (pp. 103, 104).

F. Knox has sought to explain in a simple, positive, and uncontroversial manner the whole doctrine regarding infallibility, and he has succeeded admirably. In preference to reasonings and controversies, and the opinions of theologians, he has attached himself to the acts of the teaching Church and the Pope down to our own time ; that is to say, he has gathered together what the teaching Church and the Pope, on the *subject* of infallibility, has declared concerning the *object* of infallibility and the questions connected with it. Hence he has not confined infallibility, as is sometimes done by certain theologians, chiefly for the convenience of controversy, within narrow and arbitrary boundaries, now limiting the object of infallibility, now the conditions, now the obligations, or again leaving questions undetermined ; but he has set forth the whole truth in its entirety according to the practical teaching of the Church. He concludes with showing the practical importance of holding the whole doctrine of the Church with respect to her infallible teaching office, and the intellectual and moral injury which results from limiting the Church's authority as regards the *object* of infallibility to matters strictly of faith, and thus considering *philosophy, politics, and education in the light of things wholly secular, and altogether external to the infallible teaching office of the Church*. In truth the extent of the *object* of infallibility is in some respects a question of more practical consequence than that which is so much debated at present concerning the *subject*, though both are of vital importance. Hence the book deals more with the primary, and especially the secondary *object* of infallibility, than with the *subject* ; that is, the Episcopate and the Pope, though in this second edition the question of the Pope's infallibility is treated of anew and with greater fulness, as present circumstances require. But we will speak of this if another edition of the Italian translation should appear. Meanwhile we have already dwelt too long upon the object of infallibility, either epitomizing or giving extracts from the first edition, as we could not have expressed these doctrines more compendiously or in more appropriate language.

Notices of Books.

The Pope and the Church considered in their Mutual Relations. By the
REV. PAUL BOTTALLA, S.J.

WE much regret that we are prevented, by circumstances of which our readers are aware, from giving this admirable volume that careful review in our present number, which we had fully intended; but we trust to supply the deficiency in October. Father Bottalla has written what is indubitably by far the ablest and most complete defence of Pontifical Infallibility, which has appeared in any part of the Church during the present controversy. It is impossible however to place before our readers any exhibition of his reasoning, without analyzing *the whole*: and this task, of course, we must defer to our future article. Here therefore we will confine ourselves to quoting the conclusion at which he finally arrives:—

“The opinion of Papal fallibility is in itself not only erroneous but heretical, though not yet authentically declared as such by the Church. It directly contradicts the universal doctrine of the whole Church, which is infallible and irreformable. It has been often objected that the Penitentiaria, in its answers of Sep. 14 and of Dec. 13, 1831, declared that those who still held the doctrine of the Fourth Article of the Declaration could be admitted to the Sacrament of Penance and absolved. But they who urge this objection fail to remark (1) that the Congregation expressly puts as a condition that they should hold that opinion ‘*ex bonâ fide et ex animi persuasione*,’ and (2) that the Congregation also declared that the confessor has in his power to refuse absolution in such cases if he ‘*aliter judicet ex circumstantiis in peculiari casu occurrentibus*.’ That is to say, the Congregation admits that to hold the erroneous opinion is a grievous sin, from which bona fides alone can excuse, and consequently that only on account of their bona fides can defenders of that error be admitted to sacramental absolution. But in our day, except in the case of a most supine ignorance or of great want in mental power, we cannot easily find many instances of bona fides: especially at the present moment, when the Church has solemnly manifested its doctrine by the nearly unanimous voice of all its bishops, in union and in perfect harmony with the supreme magisterium of the Apostolic See. Consequently, even now, irrespective of any proceeding of the Vatican Council now pending, not only is it lawful for any Catholic to condemn the adverse opinion as erroneous, scandalous, proximate to heresy, and heretical in itself, according to the example of the greatest theologians; but it is the duty of every educated Catholic to believe and to profess that it deserves these qualifications. *To censure Catholics because they make public this profession of Catholic faith is nothing but intolerable temerity*” (pp. 383, 384).

The present volume is entirely confined to the “subject” of infallibility,

the author (p. 384) promising to treat in a future volume the *extension* of that prerogative. Nothing however can be more admirable, than his incidental remarks on the nature of an *ex cathedrâ* Act. For instance :—

“For a Pontifical Letter to be a teaching *ex cathedrâ*, it is required that the Pope, either formally or *implicitly*, should speak to the Universal Church, *though he may have addressed his Missives to a particular Bishop in a particular diocese*. . . . It follows that a definition *ex cathedrâ* must formally, or *at least implicitly*, import the obligation of an absolute assent to it on the part of the faithful throughout the Church” (pp. 263, 264).

The italics are our own, as also in the following quotation :—

“When we say that the Pope has spoken *ex cathedrâ*, we mean that he has really spoken in his capacity of Universal Doctor and Teacher of the Church, divinely appointed to guide and confirm it in the path of faith. When the Roman Pontiff resolves to grant to the Church some particular Rule of faith or morals, it is necessary that the knowledge of his intention should be conveyed into the mind of the Faithful *by some of those signs which may suffice to make the inward intention known*. First, there are certain solemn formulæ, which are never employed in any Papal utterance except in cases where the Pontiff intends to speak *ex cathedrâ*. When, therefore, he uses these forms, no doubt can exist that he exercises his infallible ministry of Universal Teacher. But, secondly, it is not true that the Pope is bound to observe strictly either those solemn formulæ which are consecrated to the purpose of conveying an infallible decision *ex cathedrâ*, nor even to employ any particular external form in his Missives. It is therefore indifferent whether the Pope, speaking in his capacity of Universal Teacher of the Church, uses the medium of Bull, or Encyclical, or Constitution. There are many Bulls which deal exclusively with matters which no way touch faith, and there are many Encyclicals which are evidently utterances *ex cathedrâ*; such as the ‘*Mirari vos*’ of Gregory XVI. and the ‘*Quanta curâ*’ of Pius IX. . . . Finally, that the Pope should speak *ex cathedrâ*, it is not necessary that he should always directly define a doctrine *de fide*, and condemn the contrary error as a *heresy*. Should such be the case, we ought to exclude, from the list of the utterances *ex cathedrâ*, many Pontifical Bulls published since the Council of Constance; and assert that the Pope speaking *ex cathedrâ* cannot condemn any error with minor censures. Many Papal Bulls, of which the ‘*Auctorem fidei*’ of Pius VI. is an instance, prove the contrary. At all events, speaking generally, the Church has always understood when the Pope has intended to speak *ex cathedrâ* in matters of faith, and all have submitted to his decisions with the interior assent of their mind. If, in some particular instances, doubt might arise among Catholics as to the intention of the Roman Pontiff, the Church affords various means of removing this uncertainty by authentic declarations” (pp. 385-8).

To the former of the above quotations Father Bottalla very kindly appends the following note :—

“In this matter we agree perfectly with the view of Dr. Ward, expressed by him especially in his Thesis X. “*de Infallibilitatis Extensione*,” p. 33, seq.” (p. 386, note).

Father Bottalla does not seem to have fallen in with Dr. Murray’s conclusive and powerful treatise on S. Peter’s supremacy, in the “*Irish Annual Miscellany*.” He would have found in it a very strong corroboration to the argument which he derives from the word “*Petrus*.”

When does the Church speak infallibly? By THOMAS FRANCIS KNOX, of the Oratory. Second Edition. London: Burns, Oates, & Co.

WE are truly delighted to find that a second edition has been called for of Father Knox's admirable work; for we heartily agree with the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" that on the whole it is the most complete and orthodox exposition of the Church's integral doctrine on Infallibility which has appeared in any part of Christendom. He has taken advantage of the opportunity to make very considerable additions, especially with reference to circumstances of the moment. We conclude with two or three quotations taken from the new matter.

"Throughout the long course of eighteen centuries, not a single instance can be adduced of any one, whether bishop or layman, having refused submission to a dogmatic decree of the Sovereign Pontiff without being looked upon in consequence as guilty of grave sin" (p. 30).

"Nothing is clearer, from the whole history of the Church, than that the Sovereign Pontiffs have never tolerated any practical doubt of their infallibility on the part of the faithful, but have exacted from all the most unreserved submission to whatever they might decree. But they have gone beyond this, for they would not suffer without a protest their decrees to be judged by the bishops of the Church, even though the judgment resulted in an act of submission. 'Who has constituted you judges over Us?' Clement XI. wrote to the bishops of France (A.D. 1706), 'Does it belong to inferiors to pass decrees about the authority of their superior and to examine his judgments? Ask your forefathers, and they will tell you that it is not the part of individual bishops to discuss, but to fulfil, the decrees of the Apostolic See. Assuredly if you had considered the form of Our Apostolic constitution, which was not devised by Us, but has been used by Our predecessors through a long series of ages, you would have seen that We neither asked your counsel, nor requested your suffrages, nor waited for your opinion; but We enjoined upon you obedience—that obedience, namely, which at your consecration you promised by a solemn oath to pay to the Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the Holy Roman Church, and Us and Our Apostolic mandates'" (p. 31).

"Condemned virtually again and again by the Church; repudiated by the overwhelming majority of Catholics; leading, if acted upon, to heresy and schism; opposed to the tradition and teaching of the Apostolic See; stigmatized by theologians as heretical or erroneous; unknown for fourteen centuries in the Church; begotten in times of disunion and bewilderment; nursed by lawyers and statesmen as a weapon against the Vicar of Christ; imposed on a reluctant clergy by a tyrannical king; the new-found ally of modern liberalism; illogical and self-contradictory as a system;—Gallicanism has lived ignobly and will die ignobly. A year ago it seemed an extinct thing—the relic of a past age, when suddenly, amid the plaudits of the anti-Christian press of Europe, it was galvanized into the semblance of a momentary vitality, and at once proved itself to be the same that it ever had been, by the noisy disloyalty of its behaviour towards the Apostolic See. But the times are altered. The relations of Church and State are not what they once were. Monarchs, if they have the will, have no longer the power, to shield from formal condemnation this pernicious error. Its unexpected resuscitation, and the new manifestation of its spirit and ten-

dencies, which has astonished and scandalized the faithful, will be its death-warrant. Many who might have wished it let alone, as not worth a formal condemnation, now desire, with good reason, that it may be crushed for ever. Hence it is that all eyes are fixed upon the Fathers of the Church now gathered in Œcumenical Council round the Chair of Peter at Rome, in prayerful expectation that, ere long, a decree may thence go forth relegating this evil doctrine to the outer darkness of heresy, and proclaiming as a dogma of the faith that the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth, cannot err from the truth, whenever in his Master's name and authority he teaches the Universal Church" (p. 38).

S. Joseph and the Vatican Council. By Rev. FATHER GALLWEY, S.J.
London: Burns & Oates.

THE only adverse criticism which we are tempted to make on this admirable pamphlet is, that the connexion of *S. Joseph* with its argument is not (to us at least) very apparent. Otherwise we have nothing to express but praise and gratitude, and we will at once proceed to give our readers some little taste of Father Gallwey's quality. One strange objection has been made against the doctrine of Pontifical Infallibility, founded on the supposition that the Church may at some future time be perfectly flooded with infallible definitions. We cannot better reply to this objection than in Father Gallwey's words:—

"Even if the exaggerated foreboding should have its fulfilment, so that the time should come when we might expect some new definition every morning, yet so long as the watchful providence of God is pledged not to suffer any false oracle to emanate from the Apostolic See, such daily pronouncements, so far from being an evil, would be like the daily provision of manna. *Who will say that it is a curse to have truth in abundance?* The Psalmist cries out, 'Save me, O Lord, for truths are dying out' (Psalm xi.), but I know of no inspired text that cautions us against *knowing too much of truth*. Life eternal, our Blessed Saviour tells us, consists in this, that we know His Father and Himself. And we are often reminded of that truth which blessed S. John sets before us, that when we know God fully we shall necessarily become like to Him. If this be so, as it surely is, how can it be an evil to have our errors corrected, and to learn more and more of God's truth, for each truth is a foretaste of Heaven?"

It is objected again "that the Popes, as soon as they find themselves infallible, will become bold and grasping." Father Gallwey replies:—

"To the Popes, at least, the definition, if pronounced, will teach nothing new. I say 'at least to the Popes,' because in reality I believe that to the great mass of the Catholic people throughout Christendom the definition will bring no change of thought or sentiment. I have before me a familiar letter, written without study—an expression of the thoughts and instincts that come up unbidden; and it seems to me, though not theologically accurate, to represent fairly enough the average mind of the Catholics with whom I have mixed in my lifetime. 'From my childhood,' the writer

says, 'I have been taught to believe in the infallibility of the Pope; and it was a puzzle to me why it should be under discussion now.' But whatever may be thought of the sentiments of others on this point, I think that there can be no hesitation about the mind of the Popes. In their dogmatic Letters—in their dealings with the Bishops, whether dispersed or in Council assembled, they make no secret of the fact that they consider themselves the appointed Guides and Teachers of the whole flock—people, Priests, and Bishops, whether in Council or out of Council. Consequently, we must not imagine that the morning after the definition the Holy Father will rise with the consciousness of any new mantle fallen from Heaven upon him, or any new tiara set upon his head."

So true is this, that, in Father Gallwey's judgment (p. 30), even apart from any definition of the Vatican Council, the dogma of Pontifical Infallibility "cannot be impugned without criminal rashness."

"In past history and in the living Church the Popes in their dealings with the Church, whether dispersed or assembled, without the slightest attempt at any concealment, assume that it is their place to teach the whole flock without any exception, and to teach *Œcumenical Councils what to define*, and afterwards revise and correct their definition if need be. On the other hand, Councils assembled, and Bishops in their scattered dioceses, so far from pronouncing anathemas on these assumptions of the Popes, seem never tired of reminding the Popes and reminding the Faithful that they also assume that the voice of Peter is the voice of Christ."

A final objection noticed by Father Gallwey is, that a definition of Pontifical Infallibility will work a "great change in the demeanour of the Pope towards the Church." Father Gallwey replies:—

"Supposing that the definition do strengthen the hands of the Vicar of Christ, and add boldness to his action, is it clear that this will be an evil? Is the world at present over-governed? Is it a gain to your children that pamphlets filled with poison should remain in their hands till a General Council shall assemble to anathematise them? Would morality be less pure, ceremonial less becoming, the example of clergy and laity less edifying in any Catholic land, if the influence of the Apostolic See could make itself more felt there. It is not by invoking Cæsar, it is not by deifying what is sometimes called the sovereign people, that the Christian Church is to be protected against despotism. Our safeguard is in true and sincere obedience, for such obedience constrains the providence of our God to watch lest harm come to us through the machinery which He Himself has created."

Father Gallwey concludes by alluding (p. 37) to the "failings real or imaginary," found "in the advocates of truth." It is evident of course, that nothing short of a miracle could secure impeccancy in orthodox believers.

Paris et les Pères du Vatican. Paris : Perisse.

THESE letters, written by one who warmly advocates the definition of Pontifical Infallibility, refer directly to the extraordinary burst of Gallicanism which has so unexpectedly appeared in Paris during the present year. They have the advantage of a most lively and attractive style; and the Archbishop of Westminster, in an introductory letter, warmly and most justly congratulates the author on his "simple and popular" treatment of such "grave" questions. Nor is the reasoning less accurate because its exposition is popular.

On one question—which for ourselves we believe to be of far greater importance and difficulty than is sometimes supposed by Ultramontanes—we concur more heartily with the present writer than with some others who have written on the same side. We refer to the characteristics of an *ex cathedra* Act. "The Pope speaks *ex cathedra*," he says (p. 95), "whenever it is evident—whether by his express declaration or by *circumstances*—that he is addressing himself to the whole Church, in virtue of that supreme power of teaching which has been granted to Peter and his successors."

The following sentence is admirable, with which he concludes his whole argument:—

"Every supreme authority has necessarily the right of commanding, and still more the right of laying down the limits of his jurisdiction. . . . I ask you, then, who determines the sense of laws, except the lawgiver himself? If you doubt whether a monarch has really intended to enact a certain law to issue a certain absolute command, to whom would you apply in order to know his intention *except to himself*? Let the same course be pursued in regard to [what you think may be] *ex cathedra* Acts" (p. 95).

We observe, with much pleasure (p. 57), the very honourable mention of F. Knox's admirable treatise on Infallibility.

Ce qui se passe au Concile. Paris : Plon.

Letters from Rome on the Council. By QUIRINUS. London : Rivingtons.

THERE is a singular coincidence of tone and doctrine between these two volumes, both of which are written by persons who sincerely believe themselves Catholics in faith. This being so, their contents, to our mind, prove much more conclusively than can any Ultramontane argument, the absolute necessity of a definition on the Pope's authority in teaching.

The Vatican Council, and a Duty of Catholics in regard to it. A Sermon preached on Whit-Sunday, 1870. By GEORGE CASE, D.D., Canon of Clifton, and Missionary Rector of S. Peter's, Gloucester.

CANON CASE'S ecclesiastical position entirely prevents us from expressing freely our opinion on this publication. He considers (Preface that the Vatican Council cannot, as yet, "justify its claim to the title" of "Œcumenical"; although in its first dogmatic constitution it has expressly claimed that title. Moreover, Canon Case thinks (p. 11) that even if it *were* Œcumenical, a Catholic is at liberty to regard its definitions as not being infallibly true, "until they have been accepted by the Universal Church." If a Catholic priest can so express himself, it is of very urgent necessity certainly, that some definition on infallibility should be speedily put forth.

Joannis Baptistæ Franzelin e Societate Jesu, in Collegio Romano S. Theologiæ Professoris, Tractatus de Verbo Incarnato. Romæ et Taurini, apud Petrum Marietti. 1869.

THE publication of F. Franzelin's treatises goes on apace. We are glad to take the fact as a sign that the race of serious students is not yet extinct, nor the whole world given over, without hope of release, to all-devouring, nought-digesting superficiality.

We have already expressed (January, 1870, p. 239) our appreciation of F. Franzelin's genius and method. The general characteristics of the present volume are exactly similar to those we noticed in "*de Deo Uno et Trino*," and the writer's individuality is strikingly apparent throughout.

The extent and importance of the ground covered by the treatise "*de Verbo Incarnato*," embracing, as it does, theology proper and anthropology, is not unknown to our readers, who will find, in the work before us, the whole explored in the most scientific and orthodox spirit. In his opening thesis the author divides the treatise in such a way as to give the reader a bird's-eye view of the course to be traversed, and of the principal points of the route. "*Quamvis multiplex possit esse principium ordinis in distribuendis capitibus amplissimæ patentis doctrinæ de Incarnatione, hæc certe, quam adoptamus, tractationis distinctio* (in quatuor videlicet præcipua capita: de ipsa persona quæ manifestata est in carne; de natura deinde quam assumpsit; tum de formali ratione, qua natura eadem Verbo unita est; de munere denique Redemptoris, in quo Christus per ipsam Incarnationem est constitutus) *non potest negari esse apta inter cæteras tum ratione principii ordinis, quod constituitur in causis, quas dicunt intrinsecas, ipsius subjecti earumque simplicissima analysi; tum amplitudine doctrinæ, quam complectitur. Sub quatuor enim enuntiatis capitibus catholicum dogma,*

quis sit, quid sit, quomodo sit, ad quid sit Christus, declarandum sistitur in continenti oppositione ad quatuor errorum classes, ad quas fere revocantur hæreses circa christologiam hucusque exortæ, vel quæ oriri posse videntur."

As in "de Deo Trino," so here, the teaching of Gunther's school, condemned by the Holy See, is compared with the dogmatic teaching of the Church, and with the principles of sound philosophy, and is shown to be in opposition to both. The revelations made by our author on the state of theology in certain German circles, calling themselves Catholic, will probably astonish some of our readers. In *Thesis* xxiv. (sect. iii. cap. ii. p. 202, sqq.) there is a scathing exposure of one of Gunther's disciples. It would hardly be believed, if the fact were not beyond all doubt, that "a certain professor of theology" deliberately, and in print, appealed in support of his unsound teaching on the hypostatic union to a plainly Nestorian creed (the composition of Theodore of Mopsuestia) inserted in the first Act of the Council of Chalcedon, and condemned by that Council as well as by others. And another of the same hopeful school followed Dr. Baltzer (the illustrious professor's name ought not to be concealed), in order, we suppose, to keep that theologian in countenance, and lay the foundation of an extrinsic probability. We hear a good deal in England, from many Protestants, and from a handful of soi-disant Catholics, of German science, German erudition, German industry, thoroughness, and we know not what marvellous qualities besides. This incident is a curious commentary on a great deal of tall talk. It appears that Church history and the penny catechism, at all events, are not yet included within the "object" of German infallibility.

We should like to call the reader's special attention to the discussion on the real nature of *hypostasis*, and its application to the doctrine of the hypostatic union (sect. iii. cap. iii. thesis xxvi., sqq.). F. Franzelin takes the view which is, we believe, commonly called the Scotist. He shows very clearly, and at the same time in a manner easy to be understood, that the *suppositum* or *hypostasis* is not a modal entity superadded to the nature, already complete, but is simply the note of *totality*, by which a thing becomes perfect in itself and distinct from everything else. He also claims, and satisfactorily, as we think, S. Thomas for the same side.

In connection with the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, we commend to the reader the analysis of the greater part of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the fourth section (cap. ii. thes. xlviii. li.). The true interpretation and punctuation of Rom. ix. 5 (*qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in sæcula*) is also triumphantly vindicated against Wetstein's attempt to evade its force as a testimony to the divinity of Christ (sect. i. thes. ix.).

The present volume is uniform with those which preceded it. The paper and type are excellent. There are unfortunately too many, though happily not grave, typographical errors.

Conversations on Liberalism and the Church. By O. A. BROWNSON, LL.D.
New York : 1870.

IN an article on "Theological Errors of the Day," which appeared in our number for January, 1864, Dr. Brownson holds the place of central figure, as one in whose later writings a large proportion of those errors had been from time to time given to the world, accepted and endorsed by himself. Such of our readers as took the trouble of reading that article must have perceived that, while we did not spare the aberrations of the able and eloquent journalist, we, from first to last, drew a marked distinction between him and the mass of other tainted writers whom we there named or alluded to. We throughout desired to treat him with as much respect and tenderness as was compatible with an earnest effort to defend the cause of sacred truth. We ascribed his deviations from the old and royal path partly to an ill-regulated zeal for the conversion of non-Catholics, but principally to a new and too close and confiding familiarity with a set of scribes, immeasurably his own inferiors in every high and ennobling quality of head and heart. At the very outset of our strictures we stated, in the most explicit terms, our firm conviction of his subjective orthodoxy, and our entire acceptance of his repeated protestations to that effect.

Very soon after the appearance of that article, we learned that the celebrated "Quarterly Review," which had borne his nameso many years, ceased exist. From that time we had not the pleasure of reading any production from his ready and vigorous pen. While our last number was issuing from the press we heard, and heard with unbounded delight, the double good news, that a new work of Dr. Brownson's on a most important subject had been published, and that it was altogether on the right side. We lost no time in procuring the volume ; and, having got it into our hands, we read it through at once, swallowing it at a single gulp. The task was easy, for the volume is a small one ; but had it been ten times as large the labour would not have been less a labour of love. In point of composition it is fully equal to any of his previous essays. In strong, clear, acute reasoning we cannot remember any one of them that we would put on a level with it. Then, sensitive as are our theological nerves, we did not meet, from beginning to end, a single objectionable sentence, or phrase, or word. There is, moreover, a total absence of those exaggerations and hasty judgments which used occasionally to offend the sense of thoughtful and dispassionate readers. In the following passage of his short preface Dr. Brownson strikes the key-note of the whole volume, and, no doubt of all his future writings :—"The doctrine is, I believe, rigidly orthodox. I have sought neither to offend the world nor to conciliate it. I do not believe in making concessions of what is not mine to concede. I have explained the teachings of the Church where they conflict with the spirit of the age ; but I have not sought to conform them to that spirit. The Church was instituted by our Lord to govern the world according to the Divine Reason and Will, not to be governed by it." These words contain truths

of the deepest moment, and point out the one unerring principle of thought and action in all things, wherein the wisdom of this world and the wisdom of the Gospel, as interpreted by the Church, come into contact.

Both the book and the subject are too important not to demand a more lengthened and elaborate reviewal than we can now devote to them. This we reserve for a future occasion—probably our next issue. But we have felt it a duty not to let the present number pass through our hands without publishing the glad tidings we have just communicated to our readers. To give, however, some idea of Dr. Brownson's method and line of procedure, we may briefly say here that the work is chiefly made up of dialogue, carried on between an elderly Catholic clergyman and an American "able editor." The parties meet at a retired watering-place, and are thus introduced :—

"While at the spring I formed the acquaintance of several gentlemen, whose conversation interested me much. Among them were two who particularly attracted my attention. One, many years the elder, was apparently a minister or priest, with a quiet and unobtrusive manner, evidently a man of foreign birth and education, but speaking English as if it had been his native tongue. He must have been at least three score and ten ; but his form was erect and his eye undimmed, his natural strength unabated, and his voice unbroken, sweet, melodious, and sympathetic. He had for me a singular attraction, and I felt prepossessed in his favour at first sight. The other was an active, energetic man, under middle age, well made, with dark hair, heavy brows, and sharp, restless black eyes. His manner was not rude, but brisk and a little imperious, and he spoke always in a bold, confident tone, from which no appeal might be taken. He gave always his opinion promptly and unhesitatingly on any and every subject that came up, and seemed to have left no subject in law, politics, theology, literature, science, or art, on which he was not competent to pass a final judgment. It is hardly necessary to add, that he was the chief editor of a leading metropolitan journal.

"The two gentlemen were much together, and seemed to take no little interest in each other, although I could not discover that any topic was ever broached between them on which they did not disagree very essentially. Their conversation, or rather their discussion, attracted me as a listener, at first as drawing off my thoughts from myself, and afterwards by the interest it awakened in the subjects on which it chiefly turned, and I seldom failed to hear it. Other guests seemed as much attracted as myself, and whenever we saw them seated under the shade of the old maple-trees left standing near our hotel, we formed a ring round them, and sat and listened in silence.

"The editor was a man of our times, animated by the spirit of the age, and a firm believer in our glorious nineteenth century. 'The great objection, Father,' said he one day to the priest, as I soon learned he was, 'to the Church, is her unprogressive character. She fails to keep religion up with the times, refuses to advance with modern society, and the world goes on without her.'

" 'Whither?' quietly asked the priest.

" 'Whither? Why, on its progressive march.'

" 'Do you mean that the Church herself is not progressive, or that she opposes progress in individuals and society?'

" 'Both. The Church is stationary, remains what she was in the Dark Ages, does her best to keep society back where it was a thousand years ago, and to prevent the human race from taking a step forward.'

" 'There is, I suppose, no doubt of that?'

"Not the least."

"Is it not possible for the Church to remain immovable herself, and yet be very progressive in her influence on individuals and society generally?"

"To aid progress the Church must be herself progressive."

"I have always thought differently.* Progress is motion; and if I have not forgotten what my professor of mechanics taught me, there is no motion possible without something at rest. Motion requires a mover, and the mover cannot move unless it is itself immovable. A man cannot make any progress if he stands on a movable foundation, as you may see in the case of the poor fellow in the treadmill. Archimedes, in order to move the world, demanded a whereon to rest the fulcrum of his lever outside of the world he proposed to move. The Church, if herself movable or progressive, could not aid either social or individual progress; she would simply change with the changes going on around her, and could neither aid nor control them."

"But, Reverend Father, you overlook the fact that it is precisely in herself that progress is most needed. She teaches the same dogmas and claims the same authority over the mind, the heart, and the conscience in this enlightened age, and in this free republic, that she did in the barbarous ages under feudalism, and what she teaches and claims ceases to be in harmony with men's convictions, or their sense of their own rights and dignity."

"The Church, then, you think, in order to be able to serve the world, should not govern it, but suffer herself to be governed by it, and take care to teach it only what it already believes and holds? This is a very good principle, no doubt, for a journalist, who seeks only a wide circulation for his journal, but do you think our Lord acted on it? Did He find the convictions of the world He came to redeem and save in harmony with His doctrines and claims? . . . Did the Apostles teach only such doctrines and put forth only such claims as were in harmony with the sentiments and convictions of their age?" &c., &c. (pp. 8-13).

This is, we think, quite enough to whet the appetite of our readers for the rich repast Dr. Brownson has provided for them.

And here, in taking leave for the present of our great old athlete of the faith, we heartily congratulate him on his perfect emancipation from the unworthy ties that fettered him for a time; and, though a mighty ocean rolls between us, we embrace him with all the fervour of that Catholic communion, which binds the children of the faith into one perfect and living body, as closely when half the sphere divides them as if they stood side by side, or knelt together at the same altar.

* Dr. Brownson here inserts a well-known anecdote of Dr. Johnson; but, quoting from memory, he gives it inaccurately. The following is Boswell's account (sub anno 1784):—"Johnson was present when a tragedy was read, in which there occurred this line:—

'Who rules o'er freemen should himself be free.'

The company having admired it much, 'I cannot agree with you,' said Johnson; it might as well be said,

'Who drives fat oxen should himself be fat.'"

Vie du R. P. Lacordaire. Par M. FOISSET. 2 volumes. Paris : Lecoffre. 1870.

Le Testament du P. Lacordaire, publié par le COMTE DE MONTELEMBERT. Paris : Douniol. 1870.

ALTHOUGH many books and *brochures* have been published on the life and character of the illustrious Dominican to whom religion in France owes so much, yet there was still room for the labours of M. Foisset. It was the wish of Lacordaire himself that his life should be written by the Abbé Perreyre, for whom he entertained the warmest friendship. But the death of Perreyre prevented the accomplishment of this desire, and at the same time deprived the French church of one of the most promising of her younger clergy. M. Foisset was, until lately, a magistrate of the Imperial Court of Dijon ; and he has brought to his task the several qualifications of long and intimate personal acquaintance with the great Preacher, of the possession of abundant materials, of a practised and eloquent style, and of an impartial and most Catholic mind. Perhaps his most original contribution to the history of Lacordaire is his Introduction ; in which he sketches the varying phases of the religious condition of France, from the time of Voltaire, to the moment when Lacordaire, once more a Catholic, entered the seminary of Issy. The peculiar union of bondage and sterility under which the Church of France laboured from the epoch of the Revolution in 1815 to the Revolution of 1830, though it has been noticed by various writers, has never been brought out better than by M. Foisset. There could not be a better prologue to the recital of Lacordaire's work, and a better key to the understanding of his peculiar character, than these pages of contrast between the new and abounding life that was feeling for outlet all over France, and the obsolete ideas of the *émigré* and absolutist party that was uppermost under Louis XVIII. and Charles X.

The history of Lacordaire's connection with La Mennais is given in these pages with a fulness that will seem to some readers tedious. But a historian of a man who has been so much traduced for Lamennaisian principles as the author of the French Dominican revival, may be excused for trying to make the proofs of Lacordaire's rectitude of intention and loyalty to the Holy See as complete and convincing as possible. The same remarks may be made of the details of the Father's political views and acts. It is quite necessary that the writer of his life should explain them and justify them. But the political side of a life like that of Lacordaire is just the side that will be forgotten the soonest, and that even now excites the least interest in all who are not of his own generation. To him politics were but a subordinate episode in that grand idea of human regeneration which he proclaimed to the world on behalf of the Church of Christ. His education had not given him fair means of studying the Church in her true political relation with the world ; and his want of acquaintance with the history of the Middle Ages sometimes

allowed him, in his youth, to say imprudent things about abnormal states of society. And yet it would not be true to say that he erred as to the real nature of the connection of the State with the Church. Nothing can be more orthodox, as far as they go, than the three letters to Montalembert (given by M. Foisset, among his "*Pièces Justificatives*," vol. i. p. 559), in which he expresses his ideas on the Encyclical of August 15, 1832—the celebrated "*Mirari vos*."

What English readers will eagerly read in these two volumes is the recital of his oratorical triumphs, and of his religious work. They will seek the genius who gave a world-wide name to the Conferences of Notre Dame. They will seek the ardent and mortified follower of Jesus Christ, already known to them in the pages of Père Chocarne. They will be anxious to know more of the writer of these incomparable letters, so unaffected and yet so exquisitely finished, that are gradually being given to the world. They will be glad to follow once more, by the aid of new lights, the tale of the last years, and of the last days, at Soréze.

Lacordaire's "*Testament*" (the name given to it by Montalembert) is the short autobiography that he dictated upon his deathbed. As a document for understanding his life and character it is of course invaluable. To any English reader who has not yet made acquaintance with those last words of the great orator, we can say, that he will read many things before he meets with pages so noble, so powerful, so calm, and so lofty as this supreme effort of a great mind under the pressure of mortal sickness.

We hope to have an article on Lacordaire in October.

The Life of S. Teresa of Jesus. Written by herself. Translated from the Spanish by DAVID LEWIS. London: Burns, Oates, & Co. 1870.

IT has been said of S. Teresa, as it is often said of Plato, that she is much quoted and little read. The saying was probably intended to do her honour; and it has this much truth in it, that she is certainly much quoted. But this new translation of her autobiography is of itself sufficient argument to prove that she is also much read. It will surprise many readers to be told that there have been already four English versions of this celebrated work, and that the present is the fifth. Canon Dalton's translation is a well-known book, for which, and for his labours on the Saint's other works, the thanks of English-speaking Catholics have long been due. To supply the wants of a new generation Mr. Lewis has undertaken the task, on the completion of which we now congratulate him.

There is only one book that can be fitly compared with the *Life of S. Teresa* by herself. The *Confessions* of S. Augustine, in spite of differences of author and of matter which make them stand by themselves in literature, are yet sufficiently like these *Confessions* of S. Teresa not to be dishonoured by being placed beside them. S. Augustine, a bishop and a doctor, was a genius who had become a learned man before he became a saint. His

eloquence, which is of an intense but incomplete kind, like a fire that burns amid rolling smoke, is a reproduction of the man himself. He is a singular mixture of straightforward sense, of depth, of brilliancy, and of passion. His works are, on the one hand, the code in which the Church's doctors and the Church herself reads the authoritative exposition of a great part of her teaching; and, on the other, furnishes the favourite manuals from which saints of all ages have learned to pray. S. Teresa was a woman, and had no right, therefore, "to teach." In all that is called learning she was altogether ignorant. She did not know enough Latin to quote the Psalms of her office correctly. Yet her works, and not least her account of her Life, have a completeness of learning, a genuine eloquence, and a weight of authority such as we find in very few human writings. A reader who was unacquainted with S. Teresa, but who was fairly read in mystical theology, might take up her works for the first time with a sense that he had read their best parts already. In turning over the pages of the work before us, a great portion is not merely familiar, but almost commonplace. This is one great reason, no doubt, why it is so useful to get back frequently to S. Teresa. Her wonderful and inspired instruction on prayer, her hints on practical matters, and even the flights of her highest mysticism, are easily transferred to the pages of an ordinary spiritual manual. But the spirit, the context of holy humility and bashful knowledge, the outbursts of affection, that make her work the genuine production of a real living saint, these are matters that are quite as important; and it would seem, as far as human insight can tell, that it was for the sake of these that the Spirit of God caused her to write, and to write as she has written. It would seem to us, looking back now over the three hundred and eight years that have elapsed since, at the desire of her confessors, she wrote her Life, that she was raised up at a critical moment to be the apostle of true mysticism. S. Teresa wrote her works and lived the most important part of her life in the latter part of the sixteenth century. She founded the first monastery of her reform in 1562. In the same year she finished this book of her Life. She lived twenty years after that date, and died in 1582, after having founded sixteen convents of women and fourteen of men under the severe reform which she introduced. What the world was then will be recalled when we remember that the year 1563 saw the last session of the Council of Trent. During these twenty years that elapsed between the writing of this Autobiography and the saint's death, Philip II. reigned in Spain and Elizabeth in England. In France, it was the era of the religious wars, and the massacre of S. Bartholomew occurred in 1572. The Low Countries, the richest part of Europe, were fighting for their independence against the power of Spain. At the same time, Pius IV. and after him S. Pius V. were anxiously occupied with heresy at one extremity of Europe and with the Turks at the other. It was a time when both goodness and wickedness were showing themselves on a grander scale than had been seen since the Crusades. The Society of Jesus was just born, and some of its first and greatest saints were even then living. Spain and Italy were both prolific in sanctity and Catholic learning. S. John of the Cross, S. Louis Bertrand, S. Thomas of Villanova, S. Paschal Baylon, S. John of God, S. Peter of Alcantara, S. Francis Borgia, Luis of Granada, Bañes, John of Avila,

Balthasar Alvarez, Melchior Canus, Soto, are some of the names of S. Teresa's contemporaries, with most of whom she was herself acquainted. At a time when good and evil were struggling together in so marked a fashion, it was to be expected that mysticism, which is the heroic form of Christian prayer, would be also a field for contest and difficulty. False mysticism was very common in the innumerable convents which at that time flourished in the Catholic land of Spain. The sect of the *Alumbrados*, or *Illuminated*, arose about 1570, that is to say, eight years after S. Teresa had written her *Life*; and its manuscript pages were being circulated from convent to convent at the very time that the authorities of the Church were putting their powers into action against the sectaries who were renewing the dangerous teachings of the Gnostics and the Paulicians. Those who have read the *Life* of Luis of Granada by Muñoz will remember the story of the Prioress of the *Anunciada* at Lisbon. She deceived her nuns, her superiors, a great number of learned men, among whom was Luis of Granada himself, and her fame had gone abroad over all Spain and a great part of Europe. It is curious that it was the Venerable Mother Anne of S. Bartholomew, S. Teresa's most celebrated disciple and the inheritor of her spirit, who was one of the first to discredit the deception. The name of Sister Mary Magdalen of the Cross, of Cordova, recalls another history of illusion and fraud, worse than that first mentioned. Similar facts are met with in the lives of S. John of the Cross, S. Ignatius, and others. False mysticism did not disappear with the age of S. Teresa. About one hundred years after her death came the celebrated *Quietist* controversy, when the convents of France were troubled as the convents of the Peninsula had been in the preceding century. The errors that have sprung up under these various shapes have been met by the bishops and doctors of the Church, who have preached and written the true doctrine; but what we have to notice here is that ever since S. Teresa's writings have been before the world, they have been the chief authority and the text-book, so to speak, of Mystical Theology. We need only cite, in order to prove this, three such books as the "*Amour de Dieu*," of S. Francis of Sales; the "*Direttorio Mistico*" of Scaramelli; and the "*Institutiones Theologicæ Mysticæ*" of Schram. S. Francis, in his preface to a treatise which has done more perhaps than any other work of modern times to introduce the higher form of spirituality into the world (as distinct from the cloister), seizes on the three characteristics of S. Teresa's writings, their eloquence, their strong simplicity (and simplicity meant a great deal to S. Francis of Sales), and their thoroughness of learning, or rather of knowledge. Scaramelli, living after the Church had declared the holy virgin to be a saint, uses her example as the great and peremptory proof, that Mystical Theology may profitably be imparted to all classes of the faithful. Schram, like Cardinal Bona and Scaramelli himself, finds in the words of S. Teresa one of his readiest and most authoritative resources, as may be seen on every page of his *Manual of Mysticism*. Not even S. John of the Cross is quoted by mystical writers as S. Teresa is. The former, wonderful and magnificent as he is, speaks less "as one having authority" than does the glory of Mount Carmel.

It is not the place here to speak in detail of the peculiar value of this life of S. Teresa, as a contribution to mystical science. Besides the instructions

that are everywhere scattered through its forty chapters, there is a distinct and orderly treatise on Prayer and its higher states, contained in the chapters that occur between the ninth and the twenty-third—a treatise of which every paragraph is classical. Readers will naturally go to the work, if they go at all, chiefly for the purpose of studying the science of Prayer. But they will meet with many other things by the way. This life seems to have an especial gift of infusing courage into the hearts of those who are trying to lead a life of perfection. It is not that S. Teresa makes too light of the difficulties of such an attempt. She knew well enough what it means, and she says that the world is so hard upon beginners, that “it requires greater courage in one not yet perfect to walk in the way of perfection than to undergo an instant martyrdom” (p. 260). Still, the account of her own childhood and early religious life, of her levity and shortcomings until she was well advanced in years, is encouraging to those who are but too conscious of much of the same thing in themselves. They seem to see that Teresa was a woman after all, and that the Holy Ghost made her a Saint. It is this view which furnishes the refrain of all her experiences, and it is a view that does the ordinary devout Christian more good than many sermons on asceticism. It may be true that the Saint gives us an exaggerated account of her youthful failings, and that Teresa at her worst was better than most of us at our best. Still, the impression of God’s condescension and limitless power and love remains upon the mind, and souls learn to regard perfection as not out of their reach. “Let them not distress themselves; let them trust in our Lord” (p. 261). Another general impression that is left by the words of the Saint is, that of the necessity of advice. Perhaps we should rather say, the necessity of conferring with others. It may seem a paradox to say that those who are striving after perfection feel a difficulty in speaking to others concerning the state of their souls. Devout people, it may be thought, are generally too fond, perhaps, of imparting their experiences and requesting advice. But it must be remembered that among devout people the number of those seriously and (so to speak) scientifically aiming at perfection is not by any means large, and that there are people in this number whose naturally difficult natures may prevent them for a long time from being classed among the (externally) devout. S. Teresa, indeed, seems almost to make light of the necessity of a director for people who have no desire to live more than an ordinary life, though she advises beginners to talk on spiritual matters with those who are like-minded with themselves. But when the soul has entered and made some progress in the way of perfection, then enlightened guidance is absolutely necessary.

And her allusions to confessors and learned men are both touching and startling; touching, from the affectionate anxiety with which she often declares that she prays for them and trusts in them; startling, from the demands she makes on those who have anything to do with advanced souls. One of the most thrilling passages of the *Life*, is that which describes her meeting with S. Peter of Alcantara. “I saw almost at once that he understood me, by reason of his *experience*. . . . To a person whom our Lord has raised to this state, there is no pleasure or comfort equal to that of meeting with another whom our Lord has begun to raise in the same way” (p. 241). Her delight

on finding a really efficient master in the spiritual life sometimes rises to enthusiasm. "What a grand thing it is," she exclaims, "to understand a soul!" (p. 186).

It is not to be expected that a Saint will spend much time in speaking of her own personal appearance or natural character, however much a little knowledge on both these subjects would please and edify her readers. It is from other sources, therefore, that we learn that she had a pleasant face, rather inclining to fulness; that her hair was black; and that a pair of black and keen eyes communicated to her, in common life, sometimes an air of shrewdness, not without a suggestion of sarcasm; at other times, a wonderful and commanding attraction. But of her natural character she does give us one or two traits in the Life. She owns that she has the gift of courage. "They say of me that my courage is not slight, and it is known that God has given me a courage beyond that of a woman; but I have made a bad use of it" (p. 56). Grace in S. Teresa's soul is so powerful and beautiful that speculations as to her natural gifts are of little interest. But when grace made her a reformer, a founder, and a ruler of women and of men, one cannot help suspecting that she would have been one of the "strong women" of the world, for good or for evil, whether she had been a Saint or not. The child who wanted to run away to the Moors for martyrdom, was none the less fit to defy the devil, in after life, with characteristic scorn, and to go on from one foundation to another, and from one height of prayer to another, amid all the difficulties of doubting directors, of troublesome authorities, and of what we cannot properly take into account now—the jealous scrutiny of that Tribunal whose power was as great as its means of information were ample. Another piece of knowledge that she gives us about herself is, that she had "no imagination." She repeats this over and over again, and attributes to this want of imagination her inability to make what is strictly called "meditation." It must be admitted that it is difficult to believe a S. Teresa when she laments her defective imagination. In all the highest operations in which the imagination is the handmaid of the intellect, in vivid mental portraiture, in subtle combination, in telling illustration, what she does contradicts what she says. The explanation seems to be, that the imagination, in ordinary people, has to form its pictures of things by the slow process of adding line to line and tint to tint; and this is what people do who *meditate*; but the more powerful the imagination, the more rapidly does it combine, and in some men it combines so rapidly that it seems to combine wholesale, or, in other words, to produce the picture rather by a single act than by a process of acts. This seems to have been S. Teresa's case. She could not meditate any more than a bird can walk, because she had a more rapid way of realizing the object presented to her. But that she had the power of the imagination in its highest sense, is evident. In early life, as was natural, it required to be stimulated in order to represent God and divine things, because grace had not yet conquered it; and this explains the Saint's delight in spiritual books (during prayer), in images, in the fields, the trees, and the flowers, and it throws much light on her characteristic devotion to the sacred humanity of our Lord. "I used to labour with all my might to imagine Jesus Christ, our God and our Lord, *within me*. And

this was the way I prayed" (p. 20). This was at the very beginning of her religious life. And during the twenty years or so that she practised mental prayer, with greater or less fervour, before the epoch when her supernatural visitations began, when she met with a director, and gave herself more completely to God—during these twenty years, when most religious would have been assiduously going from point to point in manuals of meditation, she never "meditated" at all. And she expresses her conviction that it was through God's goodness that she found no director during that time, for he would have tried to make her "meditate," which was an impossibility to her. The study of this her method of prayer, and, indeed, of a multitude of other matters that we have no space to touch upon, makes this undying work ever attractive to those who are interested in the divine science its author has done so much to illustrate.

In estimating the value of Mr. Lewis's translation, it is very necessary to bear in mind the difficulty of his task. S. Teresa, as all know who have the slightest acquaintance with her Spanish, is a difficult author. She seems to have no style, in the modern sense of the word. She puts things down, and heaps up phrase upon phrase full of weight and sometimes of brilliancy; but literary form is almost entirely wanting. And this cannot be ascribed altogether to the age in which she lived. If we turn to Luis of Granada, her contemporary, we find smoothness and cadence in great perfection. The explanation is, that Luis of Granada was an educated man, a professional writer and speaker, who had formed his style upon the best models of antiquity; whilst S. Teresa was totally devoid of literary culture, and merely wrote because she had something to say. The best way to give an English reader an idea of her style will be to take an example from a writer who has, perhaps, seldom been mentioned beside her. Bacon came of age in the same year that S. Teresa died. English prose at that time, even in the hands of its greatest masters, was rude and ill-fashioned, though it was full of great thoughts and happy words. Here are two sentences from an essay of Bacon, "On Innovation."

"Surely every medicine is an innovation, and he that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils, for time is the greatest innovator; and if time, of course, alters all things for the worst, and wisdom and council shall not alter them for the better, what shall be the end? It is true that what is settled by custom, though it be not good, yet at least it is fit; and those things which have long gone together are, as it were, confederate within themselves, whereas new things piece not so well, but though they help by their utility, yet they trouble by their inconformity; besides, they are like strangers, more admired and less favoured."

It is into prose something like this that S. Teresa's Spanish would naturally run. But this style of translation is out of the question. The translator, therefore, has not only to attend to word and to phrase, but he has to alter the whole mould of the composition; and there is no task which the anxiety to steer a middle course between strict fidelity and perfect ease renders more troublesome and trying. There is no doubt that the version of Mr. Lewis reads, on the whole, a little stiff; but we are inclined to think that this could not have been avoided without sacrificing S. Teresa's own spirit more than any reader would have liked. But the translation, as far as we have

tested it, is faithful and exact, and it is often happy. A few renderings here and there, no doubt, might be questioned ; and there are one or two quasi-technical terms, such as *imaginario*, *impetu*, that might, perhaps, have been sometimes differently given. The expression, "an imaginary vision" (see pp. 209—221), would convey a wrong idea to many readers, who would take "imaginary" to be opposed to "real," whereas it is opposed to "intellectual." But, except to discharge our duty as critics, we have no desire to dwell upon the few defects in an excellent and valuable piece of work such as Mr. Lewis has here given us. In addition to its merit as a new and independent translation, it should be mentioned that it is translated from the latest Spanish edition of the Saint's works, that of Don Vincente de la Fuente (Madrid, 1861, 1862), from which edition the translator has also taken the newly-arranged and increased collection of "Relaciones," with which he has enriched the volume before us. The introduction, notes, and other critical apparatus show the fruits of wide reading, and render the work complete on the heads of editing and scholarship.

Disputationes Theologicæ de Justitia et Jure, ad normam juris municipalis Britannici et Hibernici conformatæ. Auctore GEORGIO CROLLY, in Collegio S. Patricii apud Maynooth, in Hibernia, S. Theologiæ Dogmaticæ et Moralis Professore. 1870.

WE understand that Professor Crolly is either at press, or immediately going to press, with the second part of this most able and important work ; which part is to treat *de Contractibus et de Restitutione*, and is expected to appear at the close of the present or early in the next year. We therefore reserve our detailed review of the work until its completion. Meantime we would observe briefly that this is the first time an attempt has been made to introduce into a scientific theological treatise a digest of the municipal laws of these countries, similar to those which have been executed by other eminent theologians for other countries : by Molina, for example, for Spain as it stood nearly three centuries ago ; by Carrière for France in our own day. For the perfection of such a digest two conditions are essential—completeness and accuracy ; and in the attainment of both Mr. Crolly has been eminently successful. The evidences of completeness lie open on every page. As to accuracy, putting aside the author's well-known relish for the subject, and his long and close study of it, enough to say that each sheet, as it passed through the press, was read carefully by a professional lawyer of long and high standing at the Irish bar. The want of such a work has been long and keenly felt ; and every theological student should feel deeply grateful to the learned and accomplished Maynooth Professor, for the immense labour of reading and thought which he must have gone through in supplying that want and supplying it so well. Of the public appreciation of this labour no light proof has been given, in the large and steady sale of the volume, from the day of its publication down to that of the present writing.

The Directorium Asceticum ; or, Guide to the Spiritual Life. By JOHN BAPTIST SCARAMELLI, S.J. Translated and edited at S. Beuno's College, North Wales. In four volumes. Vol. II. Dublin: Kelly ; London : Simpkin, Marshall, & Co. ; Burns & Oates. 1870.

THIS second volume of the S. Beuno's translation of F. Scaramelli's *Ascetical Directory* treats of the hindrances that arise in the path of Christian Perfection from the Senses and the Passions of human nature, from Temptations and from Scruples. On looking it through, we are once more struck with the difference in value of the matter that makes it up. On the one hand it is difficult to overpraise the acute analyses, the discreetness, and completeness of advice, and the genuine and traditional Catholic spirit of which it is full. On the other hand, much of the lighter part of the volume—that which the old Jesuit Father intended to be the padding of his solid reflections—is sadly distracting to a generation so devoid of simplicity as ours. The exploits of the monks who figure in the pages of Cassian are not deficient in the grotesque ; but they have an air of authenticity about them, and they have spoken to the heart of the Cloister ever since S. Benedict recommended them to his first disciples. But the materials of the *Vitæ Patrum* are by no means all as worthy of reproduction as the stories of Cassian ; and, though our old acquaintance, Cesarius of Heisterbach, does not appear so frequently in the present volume, his place is not inadequately supplied by one or two others. We must not be understood to complain of the translators in this matter ; we are glad to have Scaramelli whole and entire. He is sufficiently a classic to stand, without being entrusted to other people's taste to be made presentable. At the same time it is well to warn the readers of this excellent translation, that some prudence must be used in reproducing such things, as the downright speeches of S. Jerome, and the stories in which the devils so largely figure. But nothing can be more satisfactory than the way in which the author continually confirms and illustrates his teaching by the words of the holy Fathers. In Asceticism anything like narrowness and sentimentality is fatal ; and there is nothing that keeps principle true and practice large, like a constant recourse to the words of those from whom the Church of all times has sought guidance. No doubt, the work of F. Scaramelli might have drawn more largely from another source—we mean, from the words and deeds of the modern saints. Perhaps many readers will be sorry he has not given more of the light of times that are nearer our own. Meanwhile, we may be thankful for what we have.

There can be no greater boon to those who are beginning the exercise of the Apostolic ministry, than the plain, precise, and wise rules laid down by F. Scaramelli on Asceticism in all its branches—on the practice of mortification, on the best methods of subduing the passions, and on the ways of meeting temptation. System in spiritual matters seems to many people, if not a mistake, at least a danger. To grow in goodness by rule is impossible ; therefore rules, they think, are apt to encourage formalism. If rules of

asceticism were the only instructions given to a soul, doubtless the affective acts of the will, in which Perfection consists, would languish into formalism. But the work of the spiritual life is a complex work, in which the head must be instructed whilst the heart is warmed. A treatise like the volume before us is not the first and the last word of spiritual progress ; but, in its place, it is none the less essential.

The editors have added to this volume a series of skeleton-sermons, founded on the work. They are a kind of index in another shape, but they offer the additional advantage of Introductions and Perorations. They will, no doubt, be useful to those who can use skeleton-sermons. They are distributed among the various Sundays and principal festivals of the year. Sometimes a little ingenuity seems to have been required to fit some of the days with a subject. "Confession" is an important matter, but of all days it would seem to be least appropriate for Easter Sunday. On the day of Pentecost, too, a preacher would surely have exhausted a great many subjects before he gave his hearers an instruction on "Scruples"; and S. John Baptist, though a chief pattern of mortification, seems to be hardly treated in having assigned to his day a sermon on the "Sense of Smell."

Of the manner in which the translation is executed we have nothing to add to the expression of our satisfaction in April. It is as good a translation as any we ever saw ; and, knowing what many translations of spiritual books are, it is a pleasure to think that such a standard work is being introduced to English readers in so admirable a dress. Four valuable *Indices* to vols. I. and II. complete the present volume.

Sermons by Fathers of the Society of Jesus. Vol. I. Burns, Oates, & Co. 1870.

WE must repeat what we said when the first part of this volume was published separately. "In no particular perhaps is English Catholic literature so deficient as in published sermons, and we are particularly glad therefore that the Jesuit Fathers are projecting a continuous publication of the kind. They could not have begun more auspiciously."

The volume before us contains, first—Father Coleridge's four sermons on "the Latter Days," of the special value of which we spoke at length on that occasion, in our July number of last year. Next, four sermons by Father Hathaway on the Temptations of our Lord ; then, five by Father Galloway, on the Remedies against Desolation ; and, lastly, seven on the "Mysteries of the Holy Infancy;" the four first of this latter part being by Father Parkinson, the fifth on the Epiphany by Father Coleridge, and the two last by Father Harper.

There is no one of these sermons which is not well worth careful study, because there is none which is not the result of much thought. This is the characteristic by which we have been chiefly struck throughout the

volume, and it is no small praise, especially in our own day, when those who are called to preach are required to do so almost incessantly, and when therefore it is difficult even for men deeply impressed with the seriousness and responsibility of the office of speaking in the name of God to His people, are hardly able to give the time necessary for thinking before they speak or write.

It is one special object of preaching in church, by which it is strongly divided from the act of addressing unbelievers which bears the same name, that the preacher specially desires to supply food for meditation, and to direct its course. Without meditation the soul of a Christian is starved, and meditation is to most men so difficult and is so much less practised than it ought to be as an art to be attained by diligent exercise, that it is no small thing if a preacher is able to assist even one of his congregation in acquiring it. And this is the especial value of sermons which (like those of Father Harper and F. Parkinson in the volume before us) exhibit in detail some act of the earthly life of our Blessed Lord, which is the great mine from which meditation works the precious ore. The sermons on the Temptation of our Blessed Lord seem to us specially useful in this respect. Thus F. Hathaway describes the "scene of the temptation."

"I see no reason for rejecting the more common opinion which places the scene in that desolate region that stretches between Jericho and Bethel, not far from the Jordan; or for doubting the truth of the local tradition, attested by the earliest travellers in Palestine, which has for so many centuries pointed out particular caves there as spots hallowed by the presence of our Lord during the forty days. This desert bears the name of Quarantana from the number of days. It would naturally be spoken of as 'the desert,' to any one coming, as our Lord did, from the Jordan. It is described as a remarkably dreary and cheerless solitude, with great masses of rock rising out of barren sand, a high mountain towering in the midst of all. S. Matthew, in speaking of our Lord's leaving the Jordan, uses a word which would literally be rendered 'wasted up,' an expression which could not properly be applied to the great desert which was both to the south and on a lower level. Elias had dwelt in this desert near the Jordan also; and Eliseus, in mystical anticipation of our Lord, had changed bitter waters in it into sweet. Hither then our Saviour was led by a direct and vehement impulse of the Holy Spirit, to which HE rendered prompt and willing obedience. He remained here alone, without eating or drinking, surrounded by wild beasts and evil spirits, and apparently exposed during the whole time to their assaults, although three temptations only which HE encountered at the end of the forty days are recorded as specimens for our instruction" (p. 97).

We think no one acquainted with the "spiritual exercises" will fail to see how strikingly this passage assists him who desires to meditate upon the temptation of our Lord in forming the "*compositio loci*" required by S. Ignatius.

We take another extract from the same sermon on the "Reality and Circumstances of our Lord's Temptations":—

"Let us excite ourselves to a lively gratitude for the consolation and instruction that our Blessed Lord gives us, and the graces that He earned for us in this mystery of His temptation, by thinking of what it cost Him.

Whenever He goes before us, it is always with bleeding feet. Let us try to picture to ourselves our Divine Master in that savage desert. He has all our human feelings, though He is God blessed for ever. The sun's rays beat violently on His head by day, and the heat reflected from the rocks around and the sand beneath scorches Him like a furnace; the rough blasts from the mountain, the heavy dews, and the damp drip of the cave, chill Him through the night; He is wasted by hunger, parched by thirst, sleepless and exhausted; wild beasts roar around Him; evil spirits in a thousand hideous forms afflict His sight. These things we can faintly imagine; but oh, you that think you love Him, what seems to you the degradation to the All-Holy One of the presence and touch of the prince of darkness, and the torture to the Sacred Heart of instigations to sin? To mere men who were supernaturally enlightened with some sense of the majesty of God and the malice of rebellion against Him, an evil thought has been worse than the rack. S. Stanislaus fainted away at a foul word; S. Francis Regis, when a child, was made seriously ill by the description of a mortal sin; S. Francis Xavier, even in sleep, was in such agony at the suggestion of evil, that blood gushed from him. What was it to the Infinitely Holy to be beset and compassed by temptation; to be spoken to, and touched, and carried hither and thither by the personification of all evil? God Incarnate in the hands of Satan! Let us try to rouse our dull minds to some warmth of gratitude for light and strength purchased for us at such a price, and to some strenuous determination to fight by that light and with that strength" (p. 103).

These extracts will show our meaning when we say that F. Harper's sermons on the different scenes of the life of our Blessed Lord seem specially intended and adapted to be an aid to meditation.

We had intended to enter in some detail on F. Gallwey's sermons on Desolation. But we have already passed the space allowed us. We will therefore only say that their object, equally important and equally clearly defined, is to assist the hearer and the reader to distinguish for himself the temptations with which Satan especially besets those who are in earnest striving to serve God. It would seem almost presumptuous to say of a director whose experience in that particular line has for so many years been so specially great, that F. Gallwey most forcibly and practically enters into the detail of that particular branch of these temptations to the unfolding of which these sermons are specially devoted.

The Attributes of Christ; or, Christ, the Wonderful, the Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the World to come, the Prince of Peace. By Father JOSEPH GASPARINI, of the Order of the Passionists. Duffy: Dublin and London. 1870.

THERE is something in the whole tone of this book which reminds one of what are called the "middle ages." There may be readers even of the DUBLIN to whom this may seem to convey more or less blame;

here will assuredly be many to whom it will seem high commendation. For good or evil, however, such is the case. The special characteristic of those ages was, that the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, His life on earth, His works and words, and, above all, His Passion and Death, were regarded universally—that is, by worldly and irreligious as well as by religious and devout persons—as the one key to all the mysteries and all the puzzles of the world and of human life. No one who knows anything of history can shut his eyes to the crimes and outrages by which they were stained. They were days of violence. The world was governed by the strong hand. For the weak and defenceless, they were, on the whole, times dangerous, to say the least: and as the weak and defenceless classes comprise at all times so large a proportion of the human family, this was a most serious evil. All the world knows, for instance, how in 1226 S. Elizabeth, widow of the Sovereign Duke of Thuringia, and daughter of the King of Hungary, as soon as the tidings arrived that her husband, the Duke, was dead on the crusade, was turned out of doors from his castle at Wartbourg, with her infant children, by his brothers Henry and Conrad. “The daughter of a king walked down the steep sorrowful and weeping, in her arms her new-born infant, and followed by the three others. It was mid-winter, and the cold intense;* and when she reached the town which lay beneath the castle, no one dared to give her shelter, fearing the anger of the Landgraves, her brothers-in-law, who had threatened with severe punishment all who should receive her. Such a thing, thank God, would be impossible in our days. Neither can we imagine a prince, who, because he took umbrage at an official act of a great prelate, should “break in upon him when sitting in full chapter,” as the same Conrad did† upon the Archbishop of Mayence at Erfurt, “seize him by the hair, throw him to the ground, and proceed to stab him,” and who, when this had been with difficulty prevented by the interference of his followers, should ravage the lands of the Archbishop, among other acts of violence burning a town “with all its churches and convents, and a large part of its inhabitants.” Men of peace can hardly be sorry not to live in such times as those. But, then, the after history of the same Conrad would be quite as strange in our days. A woman of abandoned life came to beg of him at his castle near Gotha. The Landgrave reproached her with the infamy of her life, and she declared with tears that she had been driven to it by utter destitution. The whole of the next night he spent in an agony of remorse, thinking how much more guilty he himself was in the sight of God than the wretched woman he had upbraided, because he was rich and powerful, and had received and grievously abused so many gifts of God. The next day he declared his change of mind to his followers, and immediately set out barefoot on pilgrimage, first to the shrine of Gladenbach, in the immediate neighbourhood, and afterwards to Rome. Thence he returned to Fritzlar (the town he had burned); he found those of the inhabitants who had escaped the conflagration sheltering themselves in the ruins of the

* Montalembert, *Vie de Sainte Eliz.*, vol. ii.

† *Id.*, page 243.

principal monastery, and immediately prostrated himself before them, begging their pardon for the injury he had done them. Then he walked barefoot to the door of the Church (which had been rebuilt), and kneeling down there, threw off his garment and offered to the crowd a discipline inviting them to punish him. "The offer was accepted by an old woman, who inflicted on him many stripes, which he accepted patiently." He then entered a religious order, devoting a great part of his wealth to build a church dedicated to his sainted sister-in-law, which still exists although desecrated three centuries ago, and at last died in the odour of sanctity.

Times when these things could happen seem so unlike our own that most of us are tempted to exaggerate either their bright or their dark features. Perhaps the ultimate result of actual temptation and difficulty to individuals may differ less in amount than we are apt to suppose, from those we have to encounter in our own time, but, be this as it may, the difference in kind must be enormous. A Catholic in our day can hardly fancy what it must have been to live in times when the great truths of the Catholic faith were first principles to all men, good and bad alike, the difference between them being only that one did and the other did not act on his belief. For it is only by a considerable and continued effort that any man can keep before him as his own first principles of action, truths, however certain, which half the people whom he meets, whether in society or on business, speculatively deny, and which the other half, while professing to admit them, treat as opinions which have no connexion with daily life and to which it would be bad taste to refer except in church on Sunday. Five or even four hundred years ago they were felt even by men openly wicked and violent (like the Landgrave Conrad before his change of life), to be the most strictly practical of all truths. Men like him were perfectly conscious that they were in open rebellion against the divine authority visibly manifested on earth. That it was so manifested they never thought of doubting. By this no doubt their guilt was greatly increased; as, on the other hand, it was perhaps as greatly diminished by the greatness of the temptation to crimes of violence thrown in their way by the manners and circumstances of their times. In our times temptation to such crimes, as far at least as relates to the educated classes, no longer exist, but we are placed in circumstances in which we are always tempted to forget, and at the best can hardly help regarding as unpractical, truths which to them were the most certain and most practical of all others.

Whether by this change we have gained most or lost most may be an open question: what cannot be doubted is the absolute necessity for every man in our day who wishes to be a Christian, of resisting especially its predominant temptation, and learning to regard life, as in the middle ages it was regarded by all men, as a riddle, the only key to which is furnished by the great facts of the Incarnation, the Life, the Passion, the Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of the Eternal Son. That if these things are true at all, they must give a new colour to every event and every relation of human life, reason cannot help admitting. But what reason admits becomes a practical truth only to those who live in the habit of meditation.

And as a guide to such meditation no works are more important than those which, like the volume before us, are written in the spirit of the ages when the habit of mind, now so hard to form and develop, was in one form or another common to all men. The author tells us that his object has been—

“To combine instruction with the subject of meditation, or at least to provide such a groundwork for consideration as to help the Christian to soar to the contemplation of the characteristics of the Saviour, as understood through the language of the prophet, and the chief point was to keep a middle course between the abstruse reasoning of theology and the enraptured vision of the truly contemplative soul; leaving the latter full scope to extend her view, and penetrate, as far as may be permitted, into the regions of inspiration” (p. vii.).

With this view the author takes in turn each of the attributes of our Divine Redeemer set forth in the glorious prophecy contained in the sixth verse of the ninth chapter of the Prophet Isaiah. The very fact of seeing our Incarnate Saviour, not merely in the Gospels, but in the Old Testament, is one instance of that spirit of which we have already been speaking. The author accordingly shows first how He is “the Wonderful” in His Incarnation, in our Redemption, in His hidden life, in the Holy Eucharist; how He is the Councillor; how He is God Omniscient Omnipresent, Eternal, Wisdom, Beatitude, Mercy, Justice, Might. Under this last head he passes to the might of the sufferings of the Eternal Son, which are treated in twelve chapters. Then follow three on the title, “Father of the World to come,” and finally four on that of “Prince of Peace.”

The work is evidently the result of silent meditation on each of these points; it is full of thought, and we are sure cannot be carefully read by any man without suggesting to him many thoughts beyond those which it explicitly develops. In one respect it seems to us to differ from all works of meditation with which we are acquainted; we mean in the abundance with which the thoughts of ancient writers are wrought into the substance of every meditation. It is impossible not to be struck with this in opening almost any single page of the volume. In the page, for instance, in which the author treats of the treachery of Judas, we find quotations from S. Austin on S. Matthew; S. John Chrysostom and S. Austin on S. John; S. Cyprian on the *Cæna Domini*; S. Leo's sermon on the Passion; and Venerable S. Bede on the Acts. The same spirit runs through the volume.

From the extract which we have given above every attentive reader will have seen that the volume is not a translation from an Italian work, but written in English by a foreigner. Regarded as such it is a wonderful proof of his mastery over our language. Still there is hardly a page in which a person accustomed to compare styles will not be reminded that he is not reading the work of an Englishman. We are far from sure, however, that to educated readers this will be even a drawback upon the value of the volume. Uneducated ones might probably find it difficult. But what degree of difficulty there is not more than enough to produce that slight sense of something strange and unaccustomed which makes it

a pleasure to read a work in a foreign language. It is not so much that particular words are used in a manner which the English grammar does not admit (this we have met in comparatively few instances), as that the mould of sentences and the order of thoughts are more or less unusual. On the whole, we have to thank F. Gasparini for a very valuable addition to our devotional books.

A Few Thoughts on the Infallibility of the Pope. By WALTER SWEETMAN, B.A. London: Longmans.

MR. SWEETMAN writes against the Pope's Infallibility in a tone of perfect temperance and moderation; but he has adduced no arguments on his side which have the slightest pretension to novelty. We should not therefore have thought it worth while to notice his pamphlet except for his very singular misapprehension of what has been said in this REVIEW.

He considers (p. 10) that the DUBLIN REVIEW "is probably the ablest organ of the extreme views it advocates," and that its Editor (p. 9) is "a very able and learned man." It is the more important, therefore, to rectify his singular mistakes as to what we have said. We never alleged (p. 9.) that Catholics "are obliged to obey, under pain of mortal sin, a variety of" Pontifical "utterances" which are not *ex cathedrâ*. Still less did we ever dream of thinking that "if Catholics were to get the upper hand in the United Kingdom, it would be their duty to gag the Protestant press and to annihilate the Anglican Bishops" (p. 11). Still more heartily do we repudiate all sympathy with the notion, that "if such men as Mr. Ffoulkes or Mr. Husband are not necessarily to be burned in Smithfield, it is because life is so much pleasanter now than in the fourteenth century that *hanging would be bad enough for them*" (*ib.*). As Mr. Sweetman reads our pages so diligently, we wish he would read them more accurately.

Defence of the Roman Church against Father Gratry. By the Right Rev. DOM PROSPER GUERANGER, O.S.B. With an Introduction by Very Rev. R. B. Vaughan, O.S.B. London: Washbourne.

FATHER WOODS has done excellent service in translating Dom Gueranger's most admirable and conclusive treatise. We noticed it in our last number; here therefore we will comment on it no further than by drawing attention to the very emphatic manner in which (p. 29) he characterizes the Bull "*Unigenitus*" as indubitably *ex cathedrâ*. That Bull censures no one proposition as actually *heterical*, and cannot therefore

in the strictest sense be called a definition of Faith. We have here, therefore, another proof how little Dom Gueranger's accidental language, to which we refer in our article on "the Council," can be taken as expressing his real mind.

Prior Vaughan's introduction is masterly. We would only draw attention to his mode of expression from p. 11 to p. 13. He may be understood in those pages as maintaining that there is a parity between Arians of the fourth century, before their condemnation, and those at the present moment, who deny Pontifical Infallibility. But surely Arians were formal heretics from the very first.

The Life of S. Stanislas Kotska, of the Company of Jesus. London :
Burns, Oates, & Co. 1870.

THE life of S. Stanislas Kotska, of the Company of Jesus, which has just appeared in the Library of Religious Biography, edited by Mr. Healy Thompson, is an admirable companion volume to the "Life of S. Aloysius Gonzaga," with which the series commenced, and which, we are happy to see, has already reached a second edition. These two saints resemble each other in their early sanctity, their vocation to the Company of Jesus, the seemingly insuperable obstacles which they had to overcome in carrying it into effect, and the shortness of their life in religion ; but they differ in the types of sanctity which they respectively express.

"They are sweet varieties in the Paradise of God, where, as in the garden of nature, no two flowers, although one in species, are altogether alike in their individuality. Both saints have been given as patterns to the young ; but, while Aloysius carries us on to the verge when adolescence begins to melt into manhood, Stanislas, who passed to heaven at eighteen, bore to the last the type of childhood, with all its freshness and peculiar graces, which, like to the morning air, possess an inexplicable sweetness, destined to die away with the advancing hours. Aloysius scarcely seemed to pass through childhood's season ; he comes before us as a youth while yet a boy, and he is still a youth when he dies, although a man in years ; but Stanislas, although he outstepped the age of boyhood, bears, in our eyes, to the last the soft down of childhood on his cheek, and its innocent joyous smile upon his lips. This childlike character was also stamped on his devotion, sublime as it was. Hence the ineffable familiarities and mutual caresses of the infant Jesus and the boy saint ; and again the loving confidence between the Virgin Mother and this her favoured child. Stanislas's devotion to Mary is indeed the perfect counterpart, only in a superior order, of that pure and engrossing passion of the young boy's heart, whose earthly mother sums up to him all of love and loveliness which this world can offer" (pp. 3, 4).

A saint whose characteristic grace was childlike simplicity, and whose special devotion had for its object the Infant Jesus and His Virgin Mother, needs only to be known in order to attract to him many hearts, not only among religious, but among those whose calling is in the world.

Mr. Thompson's work will, we are sure, help to increase the number of S. Stanislas's clients in this country. It is written in a very attractive style, and by the picturesqueness of its descriptions brings vividly before the reader the few but striking incidents of the Saint's life. At the same time it aims at interpreting to us what it relates, by explaining how grace and nature combined to produce, in the short space of eighteen years, such a masterpiece of sanctity.

"Piccol giovane, ma gran santo,"—such was the antithesis which Urban VIII. adopted with reference to Stanislas when speaking of him to the Bishop of Wilna; 'a little youth, but a great saint.' Like some cherub fresh from the hands of his Creator, who earned his beatitude in one blessed moment, by one perfect holocaust of self, by one inexpressible act of charity, the worth of which cannot be measured by time, Stanislas appeared ripe for glory from the moment that the light which lighteth every man who cometh into the world dawned on his young reason; and if he tarried on earth for a few short years, one might almost deem him left rather than we might have the boon of beholding him than in order to complete a spiritual stature which seemed, as it were, finished as soon as begun" (p. 5).

With this extract we take our leave of a book for which we augur great popularity, and which we trust will speedily be followed by the other lives which are now in preparation for the series.

The Landing of S. Augustine. A Narrative in Verse intended for Recitation. By the Very Reverend Canon OAKELEY, M.A. London: Burns. Price 3d.

THESE few pages will recall to many persons now in the bosom of the Church recollections of more than thirty years ago, when the Oxford movement was in its beginning, and when those who heard the name of Mr. Oakeley, among those likely to be carried away with it, used to shake their heads, incredulous of the fact that any one on whom the taste and the talent for elegant literature was so much developed would really give himself up to theology. Grace is stronger than nature, and has prevailed in this as in many other cases. The tract before us contains a spirited and beautiful version of the immortal history of S. Augustine and S. Gregory, in some two hundred lines, of the metre of "Marmion," and peculiarly well adapted for recitation both by metre and shortness. They "were written at the request of Mr. S. M. Bellew, and had the advantage of being recited in public by that gentleman. They are now printed, chiefly for the use of colleges and schools. The historical incidents on which they are founded are too well known to require explanation, but it may be added that the subject was suggested to the writer by the graphic description of S. Augustine's landing, in the first of Dean Stanley's Historical Papers in the 'Memorials of Canterbury.'"

The Religious Reading Book for the use of Catholic Schools. By a Diocesan Inspector. No. 1, suitable for children in Standards II. and III. London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

THIS excellent and useful little book has the great advantage of being in a capital bold type, and is, in this and other respects, exactly what children want. It gives the substance of Scripture history from the Creation to the giving of the Law, and from the Annunciation of our Blessed Lady to the Ascension. The language is studiously plain and easy ; and (what we consider a great advantage) the compiler has not made the mistake of confining it to words of one syllable. Every one who tries the experiment must at once see that many words of one syllable are both more difficult and also, as a general rule, less useful to a child when learned. No doubt, such words as cat, dog, &c., are easy ; but this is not merely because each has only one syllable, but also because that syllable is a simple one. But a word of two such simple syllables is far easier to a child than one consisting of a single, more complex syllable. Try, for instance, any child beginning to read, upon two such words as "strength" and "power," and you will find that he reads the two syllables much the easiest. Besides, when a writer is bound to confine himself to words of one syllable, he is forced to use many out-of-the-way words, which are comparatively rare in other books or in conversation. Now, these words, even when learned, are less useful to a learner. What he wants is to learn first the words he is sure to meet with most frequently. For, observe, none of us really read by syllables. Our eye becomes accustomed to the look of a word as a whole ; and when we see it again, we do not look at its syllables separately, but at the whole. The proof of this is, that any man, however much in the habit of reading aloud, when he falls upon any long combination of syllables which he never saw before (whether it is some unknown word, or some proper name), is sure to hesitate for a moment ; and it is quite a chance whether he reads it the first time right or wrong. It is just the same with children learning to read. When they have read a word two or three times, they know it by sight and recognize it as a whole, without thinking of the separate letters or syllables. A new word they are obliged to spell. And hence, many of the best teachers now teach, not syllables but words ; having a little box with many simple words printed each upon a separate card. It is therefore important to the child to become early familiar with the words which it is likely to meet oftenest ; and this it fails to do if confined to words of one syllable.

This little book contains weighty and blessed truths in language perfectly plain and simple. Indeed, our only doubt is whether the writer has not in one respect carried this all-important principle too far. It may be that his more extended experience has suggested what we question ; but we cannot help thinking that it would be better to leave unchanged words with which a Catholic child is sure to be familiar, even before it learns to read. For instance, the answer of our Blessed Lady to the angel would surely be as in-

telligible to any Catholic child as the substitute for them :—"Here am I for God to do what He likes with me, for I am His servant. Let it be done as you say." Neither do we see that "you" is more intelligible than "thou," while as being familiar, while "Thou" is reverend, we should be particularly sorry to accustom the ears of a child to hear it used in addressing our Blessed Lady, or, even more, our Lord. Why, for instance, should a child be taught to think that S. Peter said to Him,—“Lord, if it is you, tell me to come to you on the water.”

We feel the more strongly on this point because, as *vous* in French is reverend, and *tu* familiar, and, as therefore, *vous* is rightly used in such cases, there are grown-up people absurd enough to adopt, in English, the familiar term "you" instead of the reverend term "thou." It would be a pity indeed should the ears of any child be reconciled to such an usage by early habit.

A Hundred Sonnets. By JOHN CHARLES EARLE, B.A. Oxon. London : John Camden Hotten.

MR. EARLE has got the gift of writing sonnets in a remarkable degree, and it is an uncommon gift. It has been a favourite exercise of great poets, and one in which they have not uniformly succeeded, for the conditions of success, though few, are strict. The sonnet must be in its way simply complete, *totus teres atque rotundus*. There is no fifteenth line to which the meaning can be turned over, and the relation of the fourteen lines each to each are adjusted by rules almost as strict as those of geometry. Nevertheless a good sonnet must wear an air of absolute ease, as if it was only from utter exhaustion of its meaning that it stopped where it does, and must move in its rigid fetters as if they were wreaths of flowers. In his hundred experiments, Mr. Earle has tried the sonnet in its every mood, always with fair, sometimes with signal success, of which the best proof we can give, is to ask our readers to contrast the following three :—

“THE RENEGADE.

Your ample brow had not a wrinkle then ;
 Your mouth was ringed with smiles ; your eye shone bright ;
 You seemed the meekest, happiest of men,
 Your heart so single, and your spring so light ;
 Your judgment clear, your footsteps ordered right.
 But all is changed, yea, sadly changed, from when
 I knew you first : you cavil at the Light,
 And gainsay all to which you cried amen.
 So have I seen a good ship newly tarred
 And painted, with her sails set, clear the rocks,
 Serenely thread the straits, and breast unmarred
 The outer sea, then, tossed in tidal shocks,
 Return dismasted, leaky, tempest-scarred,
 And tugged to wretched moorings in the docks.”

"THE ASSUMPTION.

I CANNOT think they love the Lord aright,
 Or by His promised Spirit have been taught,
 Who from His mother derogate in aught,
 And grudgingly withhold her sovereign right,
 And find one speck upon her shield of light,
 And deem the sacred vessel which has brought
 Incarnate God into the world is naught
 But dust still soddening in the crypts of night.
 No ! rather let me cleave to what they say
 Who love the legends of the East to reap,
 That when Apostles on an August day
 Come to the spot where Mary fell on sleep,
 They found, where late her precious body lay,
 Nought but some fragrant lilies in a heap."

"THE NIGHTINGALE'S RETURN.

WHERE hast thou been these nine months, dulcet bird ?
 Have Bagdad's maidens listened to the swell
 Of thy shrill music amid citrons heard ?
 Or hast thou showered on Hydra's asphodel
 Clear notes prolonged beside some marble well ?
 Or trilled thy song of love hard by the herd
 Of antelopes ? or where Nile's cataracts fell
 Did lotus, palm, and melon, catch thy word ?
 I take it kindly of thee that at last
 Thou art come back to us without a call :
 No Syrian groves or blooms could hold thee fast,
 Nor thy quick brain to such extent intrall
 But this instinctive preference through it passed—
 'The English woods and roses beat them all !'

The Art of Poetry of Horace, with Translations in Prose and Verse. By the Very Rev. DANIEL BAGOT, B.D., Dean of Dromore, Vicar-General of Newry and Morne, and Chaplain to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. Edinburgh and London : William Blackwood & Sons. 1869.

THOUGH Horace's Art of Poetry is not strictly an essay in verse on that important subject, but a familiar letter addressed to Piso, yet it embodies most of the golden rules of the art, and will continue, as long as literature shall last, to be one of the best exemplars of their application. Hence it has always been a general favourite ; and, being free from that license of expression which marks so many of Horace's compositions, it is expected to form an item in the studies of every well-educated Catholic. It is the more obnoxious to criticism because it is essentially critical ; but from this ordeal it has ever had much to gain and nothing to fear. To translate well so pithy and faultless a production is anything but an easy task, and

Dean Bagot has shown no small courage in attempting it. He seems to have thought it hopeless to represent the original in an equal, or nearly equal, number of words and lines, and has, therefore, been obliged in many cases to expand Horace's terse measure. He amplifies the original, not indeed to the utmost, but sufficiently to develop the author's entire meaning; in the prose, he does this with great advantage to the learner, and in the verse, without weakening and watering down the ideas more than is simply inevitable in a translation. Sometimes we find him beating out one or two Latin words into a very wide spread of gold leaf, as when he renders *molles capillos* by "soft flowing tresses—tresses that look like burnished threads of gold." Usually, however, the Dean is not so diffuse, and confines himself to such similes and illustrations as are contained or implied in the text. Now and then he is peculiarly happy in condensing Horace's lines into an equal number of English iambs. Thus:—

*"Versibus impariter junctis querimonia primum,
Post etiam inclusa est voti sententia compos,"*

is rendered—

*"First plaintive strains lines elegiac move,
Then vows of lovers realized in love."*

We are, in the present day, deluged with what is called poetry, yet we believe that very little which deserves the name issues from the press. Wherever it is really found, it has in it a principle of vitality which is proof against the shocks of time and the blows of fate. It is not washed down into oblivion when the season is over, nor sold for waste paper after long residence on dusty shelves. It is so rare that men account it precious, and hoard it as a treasure. But, not only is true poetry scarce, we are persuaded that good versification also is seldom to be met with. Writers whose thoughts and expressions are commonplace are not likely to bestow patient care on the elaboration of work which they feel cannot last long. Perhaps, too, there is a closer connection than people generally suppose between the art and the spirit of poetry. Wherever the art of making verses is present in a remarkable degree, the spirit will not be wanting. The workmanship and the *afflatus* will go together. Images really beautiful will be conveyed by due procession of sound and "music in the bounds of law." Many "poets," as they are called, in our day habitually defy the rules of art, as though they were superior to them; but such carelessness and presumption ought not, in our opinion, to be condoned. If rhyme, for example, be adopted, it ought to be adhered to too strictly and under all circumstances. In a translation like that before us, the difficulty there may be in rendering the original into the vulgar tongue ought not to be an excuse for occasional slipshod rhymes, such as "storm," with "alarm," "God" with "clad," "can" with "vein," and some half-dozen others.

It will be said, probably, that a thousand examples of such loose rhyming may be found in Pope, Byron, and other masters of heroic measure, and that a recent critic—Mr. Rossetti—has, in his edition of Shelley's works, vindicated such indifference to correct rhyming on principle. But to this we reply, that

no examples whatever can justify breach of the rules of art ; that loose rhymes are blemishes — they balk the ear which is intend to drink in music. Dean Bagot can be charged with very few such offences in the entire translation of the "Art of Poetry," which consists of 834 lines. These, however, may easily be corrected in a future edition. On the whole, we are highly pleased with the Dean's performance ; it is vigorous, flowing, scholarly, and exact. He thoroughly appreciates the force and beauty of the original, and his translations in prose and verse, taken together, form an admirable commentary on one of the most valuable pieces bequeathed to us by antiquity.

NOTE CONCERNING MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS.

IN reply to the inquiry of our reverend correspondent, "Clericus Scotiæ," it is hardly necessary to say that the literature of the controversy regarding the life and character of Mary, Queen of Scots, is most voluminous. The chief contemporary authorities were, on her side, Bishop Leslie, and on the other side, Buchanan. But it was not until the last century that the historical evidence came to be carefully examined. Robertson and Laing, in the general History of Scotland, entered at great detail into all the questions regarding Mary Stuart; and Goodall, Whitaker, and the elder Tytler devoted special treatises to the subject. Of these, by far the most careful and scholarlike is that of Tytler, grandfather of the late Patrick Frazer Tytler, author of the well-known "History of Scotland."

With these publications, the interest of the subject for a time died out; but it was revived about thirty years since by the publication of a large body of new evidence in the vast collection of papers illustrative of the life of Mary Stuart, made by Prince Alexander Labanoff; and by the new studies on the subject—founded on these and other original materials—of Miss Strickland, in her "Lives of the Queens of Scotland"; and of Mr. Patrick Frazer Tytler, in his "History of Scotland." Of these writers, Miss Strickland is decidedly favourable; Mr. Tytler is, at the least, less favourable than was his grandfather in the "Inquiry" referred to above. They were followed by M. Mignet in an elaborate essay in two volumes, the whole tendency of which was hostile to Mary; and by Mr. Burton in his "History of Scotland," whose view is equally hostile. Still more violent and almost fanatical is the record of the career of the Scottish Queen in Mr. Froude's "History of England," the very excesses of which have led to a strong re-action in her favour, evinced by the works of Mr. MacNeil Caird and Mr. Hosack, reviewed in a recent number. Mr. Hosack's book is by far the most careful summary of the evidence which has yet been made; and in that work, supplemented by Miss Strickland's "Life of Mary, Queen of Scots," and M. Wiesener's "Marie Stuart et le Comte de Bothwell"; and, still more, the same author's essay, entitled "Marie Stuart et ses derniers Historiens," published in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, livraisons 8—10, 1868 our correspondent will find all the best that has been written on the subject since the publication of the new historical evidence recently brought to light.